

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1404019

All-American Conference of Bishops

Washington, D. C.

October, 1903



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

BX
5021
C6
1903

CONFERENCE OF BISHOPS

OF THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN CANADA

AND OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

IN THE UNITED STATES

HELD AT THE

PRO-CATHEDRAL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

IN OCTOBER, 1903.

NEW YORK
THOMAS WHITTAKER
PUBLISHER

JOHN RICHARDSON

1871

CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN CANADA

1871

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

IN THE UNITED STATES

THE MERSHON COMPANY PRESS

RAHWAY N. J.

THE CANADIAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH

1871

THE CANADIAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH

1871

PREFACE.

THE Papers which this volume contains embrace, with a single exception, those which were read at a recent Conference of the Bishops of the Church of England in the Western Hemisphere, and the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, held at Washington, D. C., in October, 1903.

The subjects of which they treat, and the sequence in which they were read, will be indicated in the Order which, in this volume, follows this note. The value of the Papers will be estimated, of course, by such judgment as the reader may bring to them.

But whatever that may be, of the value of the occasion there can be no doubt. Not infrequently, for well-nigh a century, had individual Bishops of the Anglican Communion honored the American Church, and especially its General Conventions, with their presence, and almost as often had Bishops from the United States enjoyed the hospitality of their Canadian Brethren. But in either case the visitor was only a guest, and the larger comity of two Sister Communions was, at the best, but very imperfectly recognized.

At the Conference in Washington, Bishops of both nationalities (from first to last, nearly one hundred in number) sat as one body, and in absolute equality, and deliberated concerning the gravest interests and largest mission of the Kingdom of God among men. Such an assemblage had, as some at any rate who participated in it believed, a prophetic significance. It recognized the Oneness of Christ's Body, of whatever race or lineage; and it recognized no less what Lamennais long ago pointed out—the pre-eminent competency of the Episcopal Church, as not standing for a part, but for the whole of the primitive deposit of the Apostolic Faith and Order, to be the messenger of Jesus Christ to men in this twentieth century and on the American Continents.

The publication of this volume was intrusted, as to a committee appointed by the whole body of bishops, to the undersigned.

HENRY C. POTTER,

Bishop of New York, Chairman.

WILLIAM A. LEONARD,

Bishop of Ohio.

ALEXANDER MACKAY-SMITH,

Bishop Coadjutor of Pennsylvania.

CONTENTS.

Sermon at the Opening Service by the Bishop of Albany .	1
The Relations of the Several Branches of the Anglican Communion in America to One Another.	
First Paper by the Bishop of Quebec	8
Second Paper by the Bishop of Massachusetts	13
The Attitude of our Church toward Churches Subject to the Roman Obedience.	
First Paper by the Bishop of Maryland	19
Second Paper by the Bishop of Porto Rico	24
The Development of Autonomous Churches in Heathen Lands.	
General Paper by the Bishop of New Jersey	30
The Development of Uniat Churches in our own Country.	
General Paper by the Bishop of Vermont	36
The Attitude of our Church toward the Protestant Communions around Her.	
(a) Points of Union and their Emphasis.	
First Paper by the Bishop of Tennessee	42
Second Paper by the Bishop Coadjutor of Montreal . .	53
(b) Points of Difference and their Explanation.	
First Paper by the Bishop of Pittsburgh	61
Second Paper by the Bishop of Niagara	72
Methods of the Church's Work in Evangelizing the Specially Dependent Races in America.	
(a) The Negro Race.	
First Paper by the Bishop of Southern Virginia . .	78
Second Paper by the Bishop of Honduras	87
(b) The Indian Races.	
First Paper by the Bishop of North Dakota	93
Second Paper by the Bishop of Calgary	103

The Obligation of the Church to Maintain the Christian Family in its Integrity.

(a) Divorce and Unlawful Marriage.

First Paper by the Bishop of Albany . . . 107

Second Paper by the Bishop of Toronto . . . 118

(b) The Discharge of the Parental Obligation.

First Paper by the Bishop of Missouri . . . 123

Second Paper by the Bishop of Huron . . . 131

The Adaptation of the Church's Methods to the Needs of the Twentieth Century.

(a) To Meet Religious Difficulties. The Lord's Day and Family Worship.

First Paper by the Bishop of New Hampshire . . 136

Second Paper by the Bishop of Nova Scotia . . 142

(b) The Inculcation of Political and Commercial Morality and the Maintenance of High Ideals.

First Paper by the Bishop of New York . . . 150

Second Paper by the Bishop Coadjutor of Southern Ohio . . . 156

Sermon at the Closing Service by the Bishop of Nova Scotia 164

Index . . . 177

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ALL-AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CONFERENCE.

TUESDAY MORNING.

SERMON AT THE OPENING SERVICE.

THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM CROSWELL DOANE, D.D., LL.D.,
BISHOP OF ALBANY.

"They were all with one accord in one place."—Acts. ii. 1.

One goes back to-day, in this most august gathering, to a far-off tradition and a nearer memory; the nearer lives, I am quite sure, with fadeless force, in the minds of many of the bishops here, of an afternoon in the great hall at Lambeth, when, after a long session of earnest thought and speech about missionary work, the great, old Archbishop Temple rose from his chair, and held us spellbound with words that were winged with an eagle flight, soaring to a true heavenly height of intense earnestness and enthusiasm. "The fire kindled, and at last he spake with his tongue" upon the question, which always lay nearest to his big heart, the extension of the Kingdom of God on earth. It was in a larger and wider way what this is, the gathering of bishops from the English-speaking world. There were men there, like those at Nicea, marked with the scars of their sufferings from "perils by land, and perils by water, and perils in the wilderness, and journeyings often" through every part of the habitable globe. And they were all of one accord in that one place, from which they went out, stirred with a new energy and girded for more enterprise, by the power with which he spake, as the Spirit gave him utterance.

However we must sorrow that we shall see his face no more, I am sure that the echoes of his voice abide with us still, as the seashell never loses the rhythmic resonance of the rolling waves. It was truly an "upper chamber," that afternoon, in which we were gathered together with one accord, with one mind.

And the far-away tradition is more splendid still. The almost natural and inevitable interpretation, it seems to me, of that upper chamber, to which the revisers, I am glad to say, have restored its definite article, is that it was the guest chamber of that house to which the two disciples were directed, and in which they prepared that greatest of all feasts, when the dear Lord gathered His twelve apostles on the night in which one of them betrayed Him, the only one that was not of one mind with the rest.

Here, St. Luke tells us, day by day, during the ten expectation days, they gathered, not in dull and inactive patience, much less in any impatience of distrust and unbelief, but in the continuance of constant prayer and supplication; not the twelve only, but the blessed Mother of our Lord, and the brethren.

And here, when the time was fully come, came the Pentecost, not merely with its startling tokens of power, the cleansing wind and kindling fire; not merely with its strange sign of divers tongues, but with its far greater power, its far more important function, and its far wider reaching grace of inspiration and adaptation.

I am quite sure we miss the mark when we read this story as though it were an act of cyclonic violence, or as though the miracle of it was that which made linguists out of ignorant Galileans, whether for all their lives or for that single day. It seems to me a more marvelous thing that their tongue-tied timidity was turned into intense and irresistible utterance, and their souls afire with the irrepressible enthusiasm of missions, so that they could seek out and speak to all sorts and conditions of men, first, or at once, to the gathered representatives of the world-wide dispersion, and then, beyond that, to the Gentiles, to whom "also God granted repentance unto life." They were fitted from that time to go into all nations and let every man hear "in the tongue in which he was born the wonderful works of God."

Surely, Right Reverend Fathers and Brethren, these are the fitting thoughts for us to-day, the lesson that we need to learn, the reason for our gathering here from every part of this great continent of America, that we may be of one accord in this one place, and get what God will give us in answer to our earnest prayer—first, inspiration for, and then adaptation to, the work which God has given us to do.

I feel that I may write down to-day the words which old John Talbot, one of the first missionaries of the Venerable Society in this country, wrote as the heading of the parish register of my dear father's old St. Mary's Church in Burlington: "*Laus Deo apud Americanos*," for we are all Americans here to-day, not less than we are all Englishmen everywhere. All Englishmen, because we come from the same mother country, and speak the same mother tongue, and all Americans because the United States are only of America, even though sometimes we seem to think that they are *all* America. But the vast continent whose shores are washed by two great oceans is the continent of America not more in Florida and Washington than in far-off Athabaska and Rupert's Land.

And the inspiration is of one-mindedness. It would be a shame to speak in the face of our comparative numerical smallness, with any word or thought of boasting, as to our right and title to be or to be called the American Church. But unless we are persuaded in our own minds that to be this is our mission, we shall

come short of what has been given us to do—to possess the continent for Him.

When we have wasted breath in boastfulness of our heritage, we have spent force that should have been used in other ways. When we have gloried in the fact of the absorption into our communion, here and there, of Roman converts, and here and there, of those who have been brought up in the other Protestant communions, we have deafened our ears to the true call of duty, and deluded our minds as to the chief object of our ecclesiastical existence.

The aim and effort of our labors and our prayers should be, first, by intensifying our own oneness, to make good Christians, of whatever name, of one mind and of one accord, and then to take our place in a strong movement to reach those who either never have confessed the name of Christ, or else have come to deny Him; to build ourselves up on our most holy faith; to prove ourselves, not successors in office, but inheritors of the spirit of the apostles; to manifest the power, and not to magnify the beauty of our liturgy; to confess our faith not merely in the time-tested and time-honored symbols of it, of which we have been put in trust, but to live it, in the intense earnestness of men who know themselves *His* children, who “maketh His sun to rise on the just and the unjust,” and *His* servants, Whose love knew no limit to His redeeming sacrifice but the human race; and *His* temples, Who gave Himself freely as the air (which is the type of the Holy Spirit) and Whom the Father giveth to all them that ask Him.

Somehow, it seems to me that we are belittling ourselves with too much dwelling upon small things. Within and among ourselves there is grave need to restrain the lawlessness of false teaching, either in the denial of the Catholic verities, or in the proclaiming of modern errors and untruths. Within and among ourselves there is great need to set some boundary line to the individual willfulness of ritual, which, with the true spirit of the old heresiarchs, picks out what it thinks pretty here and there from various sources, and makes as many uses as there are willful minds, in the stead of the dignified uniformity of the Church's standards.

But the strength, and time, and voice, and printer's ink that are expended on these things are disproportionate and unworthy. The self-consciousness of our inherent power, spent upon the self-conviction of our tremendous responsibility, to preach the Gospel, to extend the Church, to convert the unbeliever, to convict the sinner, to convince the gainsayer ought to overpower us with the more strenuous love of men filled with a passion such as possessed the Master with a very “travail of soul,” and made the first missionaries of the Cross carry its conquering message to the palace and the prison, to the nearer and the farther borders of the known world.

The great growths and movements in the world and in nature

are from within out, silent and steady and secret. We count a tree's age by the rings, which have grown unseen out from the inmost circle toward the bark which stretches itself to meet and accommodate the growth.

Men build material things from the outside in. God works the other way. Spiritual growth comes the other way. And if, as I believe, we are charged by God with the conversion of this continent, we need central concentrated unity among ourselves first, and far more than we need aggressive attacks upon what is apart from us—one-mindedness in purpose, in prayer, in service.

At the outset it seems to me we lack the consciousness of our own Catholicity. It is a Catholicity which we only won by the protest of the Reformation, and it is a Catholicity which need not be ashamed of the name and cannot discontinue the insistence of its protest, the witness *for* truth in the first and best use of the word, and the witness *against* error.

We have a common Catholicity with the Latin and the Eastern Churches, plus our rejection of their additions to the old faith and order. And we have a common Protestantism with the great reformed religious communions, plus an unbroken hold in creed and liturgy and order upon the primitive apostolic Church. We are in touch with both. We cannot be confused with either.

I think I may use the quoted words that follow in this presence without the need of explaining that they refer to the Church, not in or of England only, but that they apply to wherever that Church has spread, and so to our own national Church as well.

In the memorandum agreed upon at a meeting of clergy held in London in 1898, and signed by very conspicuous and representative men, this statement is made, which is as important as it is true: "The immediate authority with which as English churchmen we have to do is that of the English Church, not that of the Roman or the Gallican, or any other Church." To which Canon Newbolt adds: "The English Church voices to us the Catholic Church, appeals to us in clear tones, emphasizing a definite position, claims to have made such alterations as were made, with a certain end in view, with her eye on the primitive Church, and with a determination to preserve all laudable practices of the whole Catholic Church."

I have no desire to imitate the growing assertiveness of the Roman Catholic Church in this country. I do think it is time to set up in plain and open view the breakwater of our position against the current of acquiescence in their claims, namely, the fact that we are an Apostolic Church with the only lineage that can make us such from the whole college of apostles, which certainly is token of a truer Catholicity than that which claims—I think without the power to prove it—descent from one apostle and from a single see.

To the man who says, "I am of Cephas," we do not say, "I am of Paul," nor do we say in any arrogant exclusiveness, "I am of

Christ." Seeking no quarrel, and in no spirit of controversy, it is not wise or right to sit still in calm and quiet indifference while the carelessness of a sensational press and the partisanship of unscrupulous politicians yield, not assent to, but acquiescence in, the increasing assumptions of the representatives of the Church of Rome; because thoughtless and ignorant people take for granted that, being uncontradicted, they are accepted by people who do some thinking and know the facts.

With the one-minded strength of consciousness in our own position, we must stand in our lot until the time comes when what yet remains of unperverted truth and unlost grace shall have the power to throw off the incrustations of a falsified history, a corrupted faith, and, wherever that Church has unrestrained control, a contaminated morality. Surely, it must be more a prayer and a desire than a vain dream that all there is of splendid power and possibility in this great and ancient portion of Christendom may one day be delivered from the bondage of corruption, to exercise a righteous authority and a pure religious influence upon the great masses of people who yield allegiance to it, even in its present estate.

I believe the truest exercise of conscious Catholicity will be found in the recognition of all that we hold in common of truth with those from whom we differ because they have either added to or given up some part of the deposit of primitive truth and apostolic order.

Even if there were reason to hold the childish theory that we could win in or wipe out the sectarianism of Protestant separations by joining forces with Rome, it must be remembered that Rome repudiates such overtures with scorn. So that, as matters are now, there seems to me far more hope of restored union as we count, and cherish, and cultivate the points of unity which other religious bodies as well as ourselves recognize alike.

Somehow, if the reunion of Christendom, organic and visible, is to be accomplished, it seems to me this Church must be the medium of overture and the means of its attainment. To win Protestantism to Catholicity and to win Catholicism from Latinity, we need more and more consciousness of our providential position, and the cultivation among ourselves of this one-mindedness which was the characteristic of the early apostolic Church, and which brought down the Holy Ghost from heaven.

The other Pentecostal gift of adaptation is our second great need. It seems to me, perhaps, the greatest glory of our liturgy and of our ancient confessions of faith, that they have avoided hide-bound, hard and fast insistence upon definitions and details. There is a flexibility in them, which, while it holds fast the essential truths and the fundamental principles, leaves freedom both in their statement and their application. Like the seasoned wood of an archer's bow, they bend without breaking, that they may give greater momentum to the strung arrow.

Certain fixed facts there are of the kind of dogma which is historic and the kind of history which is dogmatic, which are changeless as the everlasting hills. The personality of the triune God; the incarnation of the Son, the virgin-born and the consubstantial with the Father; and the Holy Ghost, God; and then the summary of the revealed and recorded acts and events in our Lord's human life from His nativity to His ascension; and then, the corollaries of these—the visible Church, the authority of Scripture, the grace of the Sacraments, the Resurrection of the Body, and the Life Everlasting. But there is no attempt to define the manner and the method of God's working, no definition of inspiration, no metaphysics of sacramental grace, no insistence upon the manner of resurrection, no infusion of logic into theology, no man-made explanations of the mystery of faith, no limiting horizons between what we call nature and what lies beyond what is called nature.

If one might make a modern application of the wonderful Pentecostal gift of varied tongues, they seem to me to mean that we can bring to the ear of the scientist, to the ear of the archæologist, to the ear of the so-called higher critic, to the ear of the materialist, our simple statement of the fundamental principles of Christianity in the language to which they are wonted, not in antagonism, but in adaptation to their one-eyed view of truth, as containing all that there is of truth in what they hold, rounded out into the fullness and completeness which contains not only all their holdings, but all that is true beyond these; and either crowds out their mistakes or corrects or contradicts them. Most falsehoods are half-truths asserted with an expressed or an implied denial of the other half. And Tennyson was not far wrong in saying "The half of a truth is the blackest of lies." Surely, if St. Paul could see a religion which he recognized, and to which he could adapt his teaching, in the innumerable altars of Athens, and in the pagan poetry of Aratus, we can go, not in antagonism, but in anticipation of a starting point of agreement, to any phase or form of error or imperfect truth, and pick out that in it which is true—and there is truth in every crudest belief—and take that as the dialect of the language which we speak and hold in common with them, and develop it into the full utterance of "the wonderful works of God" into the declaration of Him "whom ignorantly they worship."

There are difficult problems to be solved in the various directions of service to which we are called. It is impossible to close our ears to the plea which comes to us from such countries as Mexico and Brazil, or with even a closer claim of duty from the Philippine Islands. But such fair and gracious lines of policy as our own Bishop in Manila has outlined are far more along the line of Christian work than a crusade which takes the form of making proselytes.

And while I believe we are called upon to present the Catholic-

ity of this Church in what we think its fullest form wherever the opportunity offers, I am quite sure that some comity of understanding ought to be established among the Christian churches which may avoid the presentation, to the unbelieving heathen, of divided and contradictory systems of Christianity. One great end to be sought is to convert the heathen to Christ, and not to Protestant Episcopalize rather than to allow somebody else to Presbyterianize a Malay or a Zulu.

The earnest contention for the faith "once for all delivered to the saints" need not certainly confine itself to the denunciation of others or to the denial of errors. Polemic controversy is a dangerous weapon in human hands. There is a *gaudium certaminis* which gets possession of us. Nobody has failed to feel it. It carries us away into violence and vituperation, into bitterness and anger, and by and by the contest becomes a personal struggle for individual or denominational victory. Our Protestant position, rightly interpreted, fulfills itself far more, I think, as we are witnesses for the truth than as we are witnesses against error. "Building ourselves up on our most holy faith and praying in the Holy Ghost, keeping ourselves in the love of God and looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life," is St. Jude's counsel to men, whom he exhorts to deal with those that separate themselves, or, as the revisers put it, "those who make separations."

So the conclusion of the whole matter seems to me that, whether we are considering the best method of preparing ourselves to do our duty in the place where God has set us, or whether we are considering the possibility of promoting deeper and more real union among those who "profess and call themselves Christians," or whether we are considering how we may best help on the petition of our constant Litany that "it may please God to bring into the way of truth all such as have erred and are deceived," or whether we are striving to bring the knowledge of Jesus Christ to those from whom, so far, that knowledge has been withheld by our faint-heartedness, our selfishness, our separations—in all these issues and events, it seems to me the one conclusion is, and the one object of care, that we should pray God to make us all of one mind, to keep us all together in the one place of duty, and in that one mind and that one place to "continue steadfastly in prayer and supplications" that "the God of all grace, Who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, may make us perfect in every good work to do His will."

TUESDAY MORNING.

First Topic.

THE RELATIONS OF THE SEVERAL BRANCHES OF
THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION IN AMERICA
TO ONE ANOTHER.

First Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. A. HUNTER DUNN, D.D.,
BISHOP OF QUEBEC.

To be permitted, Mr. President, my Right Reverend Brethren, to participate ever so slightly in this, the first formal Conference of the responsible Overseers of the Churches of the United States and Canada and the West Indies, is indeed a very high privilege as well as a most holy joy.

When a year ago you, Mr. President, speaking as a member of the Delegates of the Church of the United States of America in the Upper House of the General Synod of the Canadian Church at its third session in the city of Montreal, first introduced to us this question of an All-American Conference, and suggested that surely there were Church problems calling for solution more particularly on this side of the Atlantic, and when you stated, moreover, that, in all probability, our thus meeting together in Conference would be likely, at the next meeting of the Pan-Anglican Conference at Lambeth, to bear valuable fruit, I well remember how strongly and deeply your words struck a chord within my inmost soul, and how it came home to me at once that this was a really great idea—an idea fraught with the mightiest possible consequences. And therefore I determined at once, if I should receive an invitation, that, please God, I would accept it and do my very best to come. And while I heartily thank Almighty God that He permits me to be here, I also earnestly pray that we may be so assisted and directed by the Holy Spirit of Grace, that our Conference shall bear the glorious fruit of inestimable blessing, henceforth and for evermore.

And now with regard to the particular subject upon which I have been asked to read this paper; its title is as follows: "The Relations of the Several Branches of the Anglican Church in America to One Another." I have been asked to bring to your attention that part of the subject which relates (1) to clergy and

(2) to candidates for holy orders, leaving it, I presume, to my Right Reverend Brother the Bishop of Massachusetts to deal with the subject in its other aspects.

But before I come to this, my own part of the subject, you will, I trust, permit me to say how deeply thankful I am that the general relations between your great Church in the United States and our own Church in Canada are so thoroughly helpful and cordial as they are, and as they have ever been. At any rate, I can speak for ourselves, and say with confidence, that *we* have been immensely helped and strengthened by your delegations, by your literature, as well as by the grand stand you have taken in great questions as they have arisen, and the progress you have made from year to year. I can never forget, *e. g.*, the very great assistance rendered to *us* by the Bishop of New York, when he came up in 1893, very soon after the opening of my Episcopate, to take a prominent part in the celebration of the centenary of our old Diocese of Quebec. Neither can I ever thank my neighbor, the Bishop of Vermont, sufficiently for the peculiar assistance which he has rendered to us both at Bishop's University, Lennoxville, and also in Quebec City, as regards what we may well call the devotional side of our Church life. At the sessions of our Provincial and General Synods, moreover, the delegations of the American Church have always been of great service; and of these, that which came to us last fall in Montreal, and which has led to our Conference here to-day, will not, I feel convinced, prove to be the least important. And in compiling our Canadian Appendix to our Book of Common Prayer, my good brother the Bishop of Fredericton, to whom amongst us it rightly fell to make the first draft of that Appendix, sets forth in a prefatory note that "great use has been made of the Book of Common Prayer, according to the use of the Church in the United States of America." And, no doubt, in framing the canons of our comparatively young and new General Synod, your canons will be to us in certain respects a very great guide and advantage. It is, moreover, certainly wise and good that our regulations and our services should be, as far as possible, similar or even identical, for thus we shall be better able to labor on both sides of the line for our mutual health and strength.

But I am digressing, and I must now therefore say no more concerning our *general* relations, but must keep myself entirely to the matter in hand. And first of all I will try to say something concerning the regulations, under which clergymen should pass from us to you, and, *vice versa*, from you to us. In England, as we all know, the conditions are entirely different from ours. *There* no man can be ordained, unless some rector or vicar approaches the bishop and offers to the man what is technically called a title for holy orders—offers, in other words, to take the man as his assistant during his diaconate and during his first year in priest's orders, and further agrees to find for his assistant

a sufficient stipend; and *there* no man may leave his first curacy until this period of two years' apprenticeship has expired, and this "old-country" system is no doubt—so far—very salutary indeed, for it causes that a man cannot become a rector in sole charge until, as an assistant, he has had some experience of a clergyman's work. But once this period has expired, neither the bishop nor the diocese has any further responsibility, but the curate may either stay on where he is, if it is mutually agreeable to his incumbent and himself, or he must seek for himself, by advertisement or otherwise, another curacy, unless indeed some patron happens to offer him a sole charge; for there is hardly such a thing in England as the extending to a man by a congregation of what, on this side of the Atlantic, is described as a call. Hence it is evident that the clergy in England who hold no appointment are merely a body of men in holy orders who owe no special allegiance to any one bishop and are not specially attached to any diocese, and this is a system which I think we can none of us commend, or desire to see imitated. In the United States, the bishop ordains, I believe, with the approval of the Standing Committee of his diocese, and in Canada we ordain men without restriction as we need them; and on both sides of the line a clergyman has what we may call diocesan rights, and he is, moreover, counted as a man of good standing in his diocese and as still having his diocesan rights until he is proved to be unworthy of his position, or until his bishop has given to some other bishop in his behalf a *Bene Decessit*, and until this *Bene Decessit* has been acknowledged and accepted in writing by the bishop of the diocese to which the clergyman is being transferred. All that *we* have to do therefore in the case in which clergymen desire to serve in a diocese across the line is to see that we will none of us ever license or institute a man until we are satisfied, after making the fullest inquiry from those who know him, that all is as it should be, and until we have received and accepted in writing his *Bene Decessit* from his former bishop. And we ought also, I think, to take care, supposing any clergyman in our diocese is proved to be unworthy of his position as a priest of the Church of God, to forward his name to the archbishop of our ecclesiastical province or to our chief or senior bishop, begging that he will notify all other archbishops and chief or senior bishops, so that they in turn may warn the bishops of their provinces or churches, and thus prevent the offender's appointment anywhere else within the borders of the Anglican Church, with a view to avoiding all further hurt or scandal. This need not preclude the opportunity for repentance, and, after a sufficient probation, a re-admission to the exercise of the functions of the sacred ministry, with due notice given throughout the Anglican Communion, as in the case of the offender's deprivation or inhibition. There may of course be cases in which a man's usefulness in a given diocese is gone, and yet, his repentance being

sincere, it may be well that he shall have a further opportunity elsewhere; but even in such cases it would be right, I think, to bring to the knowledge of the bishop to whose diocese such a clergyman is moving, in a general way what has occurred, so that he may be put upon his guard, and also have the option of refusing to receive the man, if he feels that it would be better for him to do so.

And now I have also a few words to add with regard to our accepting from across the line lay-readers or candidates for holy orders. You may not all be aware, my Right Reverend Brethren, that we have in the Diocese of Quebec, only a few miles beyond the line, the University of Bishop's College, Lennoxville, where we receive students first for their arts' course of three years, and, later, for a further two years' course, during which they are specially prepared for one of the learned professions. And of those who are proposing to take holy orders, those who really need it receive during the whole of their five years' course substantial exhibitions from certain missionary societies in England on the simple conditions that they shall take their whole course continuously and complete it, and shall then serve, if they are needed, for as many years in the king's dominions as they have received their exhibition. Now, during their course, from the end of the first year onward, these men get a good deal of practical experience by being sent out under supervision into our parishes to act as lay-readers, and now and then, in order to widen their experience, some of them have accepted work during their summer vacations across the line. And occasionally it has happened that, so soon as a man, after three years' residence, has taken his B. A. degree, and before he has entered upon his divinity course, in spite of his agreement to go on for two more years and then to work if needed in a Canadian diocese, he has written to us to say he cannot return to college, for he has obtained work across the line and will before long be ordained deacon. Now, again and again, we have gladly released graduates in order to allow them to take their divinity course in England or at the theological seminary in New York or elsewhere, provided always that they have promised to return later and help us in the Canadian Church. My object, therefore, in naming this matter to-day is not of necessity to hold a man to his agreement at our own university, if it would be good for him and for the Church that he should make a change and go elsewhere, but my object is this, viz.: to prevent a man from being admitted even to deacon's orders until he has completed his theological as well as his arts' course; for we all know that, once we enter upon clerical life, once we have sermons to prepare, and visits to pay, and other duties to perform, it is impossible to give our full strength to reading as we did, or as we could, while we were at college. I only name, in fact, our own particular instance, because I happen to know it, and I should be just as eager that a course entered

upon at New York, or elsewhere in the United States, should be fully completed before a man was permitted to be called away to give a large share of his time and energy to clerical life in Canada. For my general experience is that what is lost in this way is seldom or never afterwards regained, and, although I freely admit that archdeacons and others under whom these deacons serve give them many valuable hints, and afford them much real help, still I believe it would have been much better for these men if their ordination had been deferred. For these are days in which the laity read magazine articles and book reviews, and thus they have such a knowledge of what is going on in the critical, theological, and historical world that the clergy really need to be much better read and much more fully trained than was absolutely necessary a few years ago.

I do not know whether it is expected that at this Conference we should come to any definite conclusions, or pass any definite resolutions; but, if it is in any way possible, I hope we may come, at any rate, to some common understanding. As to the transfer of clergy, in fact, I trust we may be able to recommend to our synods, or conventions, that no clergyman from Canada may take permanent charge in any diocese in the United States, and, *vice versa*, that no clergyman from the United States may take permanent charge in any diocese in Canada, until the bishop of the diocese receiving such clergyman has received a *Bene Decessit* in writing.

And I trust we shall also be able to agree that in cases of temporary duty, the clergyman shall always obtain the written permission or license of the bishop of the diocese in which this temporary duty is to be taken.

Further, I hope we may agree to be careful in notifying offenders either to our chief bishop with a view to his general action throughout the Anglican Church, or, in slighter cases, to the bishop of the diocese whither the offender is going, with a view to making a new start in a new field, in order that the bishop may have the option of refusing to receive him.

And lastly, as to lay-readers, etc., I trust we shall be able to agree to recommend that, before accepting any candidate for holy orders,

(a) Every bishop shall expect to receive a recommendation from the man's parish priest, countersigned by the bishop or the archdeacon of the diocese in which he has been residing.

(b) In all cases in which a lay-reader has been a student at a university or college, every bishop shall in addition expect to receive the *testamur* of that university or college.

With such an understanding, safeguarded by the use of similar forms in all like cases, I believe we might do much towards avoiding offenses, and also very much towards securing better equipped men for that which is certainly the highest of all callings in the whole world.

*First Topic.*THE RELATION OF THE SEVERAL BRANCHES OF THE
ANGLICAN COMMUNION IN AMERICA TO
ONE ANOTHER.*Second Paper.*THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D.D.,
BISHOP OF MASSACHUSETTS.

The Bishop of Quebec has presented so clearly his treatment of the subject as it relates to the transfer of clergy and candidates that there is little left for me to say on these points.

The diocesan relation of each and every clergyman to which the churches in this country and Canada are committed is, though attended with some inconveniences, essential to the well-being and discipline of the ministry. Every clergyman of the Church has his canonical home, his bishop and father in God. No clergyman can so loosen the ties as to become an irresponsible rover, free from discipline or official recognition.

The one point in this connection that I want to emphasize—and it is a point upon which I believe the Bishop of Quebec is agreed—is that every clergyman of each branch of the Anglican Communion should be under such direct episcopal or diocesan jurisdiction as to make him immediately amenable to the proper authority. Thus, a clergyman of this Church, who in Canada should be guilty of any offense against ecclesiastical order or morals, should, upon complaint, be immediately brought to book by his bishop or the canonical diocesan authorities; and the same should hold in relation to a clergyman of any branch of the Anglican Church in this country.

Similar conditions may be wise, too, in relation to candidates for the ministry; though I feel that a law higher than that of the canons—that of Christian courtesy—would guide our bishops in the few instances that might arise.

What is of the greatest moment is that we should deal frankly with each other, especially in those personal questions connected with the transfer of clergy.

The subject having been thus fully dealt with from this practical point of view, I shall follow out a suggestion of the Bishop of Quebec, made to me by letter a few days ago, and take up the subject in its more general aspect.

Each branch of the Anglican Communion in America is autonomous and must remain so. Distinct as we are in administration, we are bound together in a common faith and order. Working under many similar conditions, we are in the midst of opportunities unique, I believe, in the history of the Church.

What, then, I want to emphasize is the *attitude* that we should have towards each other, the *attitude of intelligent sympathy*.

I trust that I may be pardoned for confining what I have to say to the Anglican churches in the United States and in Canada. For, while the other churches represented in this Conference have much in common with these two and much that may be said will bear upon all, there are such varied local conditions among them as to demand fuller explanation than can be given in a short paper.

Let us first remind ourselves of a few of the conditions and opportunities before us.

The continent covered by the organization of these two churches is in size and wealth immense. We of the United States may have risen to some appreciation of the size of our country; most of us have no realization of the acreage of the greater country of Canada and of its natural resources.

The population of these two countries is also immense.

There have been—and are—countries of larger populations and perhaps of equal natural resources, but there has never been such a continent inhabited by such a people as will fill this land by the end of the century.

For from all parts of Europe, and even from the East, the eye and hope of the youth, the alert and enterprising, the intelligent and strong, have looked to America. Here they have come, are coming, and will continue to come.

The Christian Church had never such an opportunity, never such a call to meet intelligence and high character, to mold material powers by spiritual forces.

Again, this is a land without traditions, free; here each and every man may experiment in thought and faith almost as he will.

In Europe the finer elements of modern civilization have to struggle up and through a hard crust of tradition, sometimes suppressed for generations, then breaking through with cruel violence. Here fresh thought, new conceptions of life, and other elements of modern civilization express themselves with freedom, free as the air.

Error of course has its chance. So has the truth, and as we have full confidence in the truth and its final victory, we have great hope. In fact, hopefulness is the characteristic of the American people; hope of the final triumph of Christ and His truth, the characteristic of American Christians.

Of reverence, as it is expressed in countries of ancient civilization, there is little; a meagre reverence for tradition and age; there is, however, a reverence very real and deep for truth, for character, for God. Whatever and whoever is proved worthy of reverence is revered.

From people so conditioned have come great experiments:

Democracy, the equality of every man before the law, universal suffrage, the people their own sovereign.

Then, in complete separation of State from Church and Church from State, there has been withdrawn from the Church the support given by its association with the national life, its social prestige, and financial aid.

Thus has been given to the Church far greater opportunity in its spiritual freedom, its sense of responsibility, and its self-government.

From these conditions have been born innumerable sects, the springing into notice of doubts, heresies, half-beliefs, and errors, which were in the people's minds, but, under the old régime, had no opportunity of expression. There has been a clearing of the atmosphere, and men speak and worship as they believe.

At the same time, the universal education of the people has been accepted, an education by the State, and with no direct religious influence or teaching,—a system at which the Church of England stands aghast.

Upon the Church and the home has been thrown the responsibility for the spiritual culture of the children.

Stimulated by this popular education, many new problems have appeared for solution. Every man, woman, and child would have a reason for the faith that is in him, and a reasonable reason.

The questions of the sanctity of life and of marriage have come up for answer: the meaning of the family. The nations of Europe most lax in morals are able to point the finger of scorn at our frequency of divorce. And yet we believe that our people are pure, as pure as any people.

May not this anomaly of laxity of morals and no divorce in some countries and comparative purity with frequency of divorce cause us to study carefully the sociological conditions before we draw rash conclusions? May not divorce be simply the recognized and legal expression of sin that has been prevalent in all history? Legislation, even ecclesiastical, may be but a plaster over a sore; a wise surgeon looks deeper than the surface. May it not be wise for the Church, instead of concentrating so much of her thought and time upon the Canon on divorce, to turn her attention to the causes beneath? to study more attentively the home, the moral education of children, parental influence, and the relation of disease to sin?

In the presence of these conditions, and in the midst of the people, the Anglican Church stands, formed from the people. That the branches of that Church may meet these problems requires, I say, mutual and intelligent sympathy.

We of the Anglican Church have in this northern half of this hemisphere a great vantage ground.

We believe that we have the apostolic faith and order. Other

churches believe that they have them too. We have, however, these vantage-points which belong to no other:

The base of Western civilization is English: the English language, English common law, English tradition, and, in most parts, English stock. At those points where France and Spain once were, English traditions are prevailing.

The Anglican Church is the church of the English people. The traditions, temper, thought, law, and worship of Church and people are inextricably interwoven.

Never did Christian churches have fairer opportunity than has the Anglican Communion on this continent at the opening of the twentieth century.

To her opportunities the Church has in some part responded. She has yielded up many customs and traditions which hampered her in the past. She has gladly thrown off her organic relations with the State. In the spirit of the early apostolic democracy she has taken laymen into her councils, and the people elect their pastors as people and priests elect those who are to be consecrated their chief pastors. One cannot but smile as he hears in England the debates and tentative questions upon this experiment. It is no longer an experiment: it is a tried institution which the Church will, we believe, never let go.

The Church has assumed again the responsibility for the education of the young—at least in theory. How far short of her duty she falls in practice is for us to consider. The education of the children in the faith and Christian life is one of the great questions upon which each branch of the Anglican Communion needs the help and counsel of the others.

In elasticity of thought and ritual too the churches have responded to the needs of an alert, many-sided people. We are fortunately rather free from the partisan shibboleths of an older country. The question may well be considered by the various branches of our Church, whether, while sustaining a general wise conservatism, we cannot meet the varied needs of the people of such an immense country, reaching from the Arctic to the tropic circles, with greater elasticity of ritual and administration.

The churches have responded to an educated people by standing for an educated ministry.

There may be parts of the country where an uneducated ministry may do effective and noble work. Let it, however, be frankly recognized as uneducated and not allowed to take the place and work in which educated men are required; and we must be careful that the word educated be not interchangeable with academic—there is danger on that side. The question of education for the ministry of the Anglican Communion is one to which we need to give our best intelligence and in which we may gain mutual and helpful advice.

I believe that our English traditions and the close relation in the old country of the ministry with letters and the

universities, together with our American habit of thought, give us an exceptional opportunity to work out a superior system of theological education.

An experience of some years as the head of a theological school and a teacher of theological students leads me to think that we have some traditions still to break and much to learn before we reach a really excellent system.

May I take the time to illustrate one point?

To-day one-quarter of the time of our theological students is given to the study of the rudiments of a language, a study which in itself is of no use to them mentally or spiritually, and which is dropped by nine-tenths of them as soon as they enter the ministry.

When the first Bishop of Massachusetts, as a youth, graduated from Harvard College, he selected for the subject of his graduation thesis, "Will the blessed in the future world after the last Judgment make use of articulate speech, and will that be Hebrew?" His answer is not recorded, but the thesis suggests the prominence of the study of Hebrew in that day.

With the change in methods of Biblical interpretation from the exegetical to the historical, with the publications of English interpreters, is it not well that one-fourth of the valuable time of preparation be given by a good fraction of our candidates to studies more helpful to the intellectual and spiritual life of themselves and to their future life as priests, prophets, and pastors? Will it not be to the advantage of the future pastor if a good fraction of our candidates, released from the irksome task of Hebrew, give their time to other studies bearing more directly upon their future work in the practical ministry?

Will it not be to the advantage of sacred scholarship, reverence for the Scriptures, and the real knowledge of Hebrew, to make it a serious study to which those who are of scholarly intention, or who have a real interest in the work, may apply themselves?

Pardon this digression, but I believe, my brethren, that we, of different branches of Christ's Church, need each other's counsel on these points.

From our American religious thought must spring, too, a theological literature which has an American temper and emphasis, an attitude adapted to our American character, full of hope and of intellectual courage, sympathetic with human interests, mystic as America is mystic, practical as America is practical.

The student of God in the light and darkness of the Arctic zone has something to tell us which no German or English theologian has felt and thought.

Moreover, our people of the next century will be a racial conglomerate, as in fact the English people are. The constituents of that conglomerate will each bring their contribution to the theological thought of the Church. We have a basis of Anglo-Saxon and of Scandinavian too; we are to feel the influence of

Italy and Poland, of Russia and France. From the East across Europe, Persia, and Armenia, and from the East across the Pacific, Japan, and China, our thought is to be affected as our art is already touched. How are we to transmute characteristics associated with Confucius and Buddha into Christian terms?

The relation of the several branches of the Anglican Communion in America must be that of intelligent sympathy, if together they are to face and work out these and other great problems.

WEDNESDAY MORNING.

*Second Topic.*THE ATTITUDE OF OUR CHURCH TOWARD CHURCHES
SUBJECT TO THE ROMAN OBEDIENCE.*First Paper.*

THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM PARET, D.D., LL.D.,
BISHOP OF MARYLAND.

I have been asked to speak upon "the Attitude of our Church towards the Churches of the Roman Obedience." And by "attitude" I suppose is meant the disposition or action which we ought to adopt towards them. Behind or below that question lies a great preliminary question of historic and ecclesiastical fact or truth. I mean the actual *relation* between the English Church and the Roman Church; the difference: the things which separate them.

We generally speak of three Churches, the Eastern or Greek, the Roman, and the English, as the three great branches of what was once the undivided Holy Catholic Church. Of the causes and the history of the separation, I need not speak. Those who hear me are fully familiar with those points. The rightfulness or the wrongfulness of the separation between Rome and ourselves is not now a matter for argument. When Rome created the schism by her own act in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, it ceased to be matter for argument, and became a reality. It remains to this day the same, save as the separation has been, I think, made deeper and wider by further action of Rome. But notwithstanding weaknesses, errors, and faults more grievous in each of the three great branches of it, each claims to be, not the Catholic Church, but a legitimate branch of it, as holding a valid succession in the ministry, sacraments valid in all things essential, and (even though they may be overlaid by additions, or perverted by misinterpretation), the essential truths of the faith once delivered to the saints. I give this as a view generally accepted; that the grand trunk, once without flaw or fissure, has been cleft into three great divisions; but the cleaving has not reached the root. And from the common root, each branch, however separate from the others, continues to have its part in the divine life. If we accept this view, that, even in the most corrupt of the three, corruption has not destroyed life, but only impaired it, then the problem of Christian unity for them will differ greatly from the like problem with regard to the many merely Protestant sects of later years. With regard to these last, there is grave question, to say the least, as to the validity of their

ministry and sacraments, and their right, as organized bodies, to part in the Catholic identity of the Church. Between Greek, Roman, and Anglican, from our point of view, there is no doubt.

What then is, or should be, the attitude of these three great branches toward each other? their disposition? their behavior? And especially, what is the right attitude for our Church to hold towards those who obey Rome? Looking back to my own early days, I remember well how almost all who counted themselves emphatically Churchmen recognized a work now largely forgotten, "Palmer on the Church," as one of the best human authorities, and accepted the principles of Church unity as there clearly set forth. On those principles it was understood that in any country where one of the three great Churches had gained legitimate possession and right of occupancy, the others should not interfere with it; should not intrude themselves. It would be setting up Church against Church; it would be schismatic. It was not always easy to determine whether there was legitimate right of occupation. Civil National relations might affect it; changes by which a region might pass from one National authority to another. The rights and responsibilities of a National Church were counted as covering all the Nation's territory. My meaning may be illustrated by the way in which the Church of England exercised authority in the early American Colonies so long as they remained subject to England; and later, in its Canadian and Asiatic possessions; and later still by certain things in our American Church history. When the United States secured their independence, the Church in this country, still continuing its life unbroken, ceased to be a part of the Church of England, and became an independent National Church. When Alaska from being a foreign country became a part of the United States, the Church in the United States at once claimed and exercised its responsibility and right. When Honolulu, where there was a bishopric of the Church of England, became a part of the United States, by kindly agreement and action, the Church of England recognized that its former rights passed over to the Church of this country; and now, instead of the English bishop, a bishop of the American Church is in unquestioned occupation.

There might be other conditions which would make the question of rightful occupation somewhat uncertain. But where there was no such doubt, and the right seemed clear, it used to be recognized, more than it is now, that one branch of the Church, or one national Church, should not intrude itself into the sphere of another. In action with the Greek and Eastern Churches, this principle was carefully observed. When in the year 1840 the Church in the United States sent out its Missionary Bishop to Constantinople and the Greek Church (Bishop Southgate), he received special instructions that he was sent, "not to set up another Communion, but to seek and cultivate friendly relations with the Greek Churches, to co-operate with them, to help

them to know and understand us, and to offer them our aid in bringing those decaying churches into fuller spiritual life."

The presiding bishop said, "In the intercourse which may be allowed you with the bishops and other ecclesiastical authorities, be careful to state explicitly what are our views . . . that we would scrupulously avoid all offensive intrusion within the jurisdiction of our Episcopal brethren, nor would we intermeddle in their affairs. Our great desire is to commence and promote a friendly intercourse between the two branches (Eastern and Western) of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church." And in the more formal instructions given him at the farewell meeting before his sailing we find it written, "You will keep steadily in view the unity of the Church. While your own obligations will lead you to avoid compromising the principles of Protestant faith and practice, you will find every motive leading you, in recognizing the Apostolical character of those Christian Churches, to aid in averting the evils of schism. In all that pertains to the ministerial function you have carefully considered the rights of those who bear spiritual rule. You will avoid all that shall interfere with those rights, and . . . you will endeavor, on proper occasion, to promote also the Christian integrity of those churches within whose pale you may reside."

And later, in the appointment of a Bishop of Jerusalem, and in the mission sent out to the Assyrians by a former Archbishop of Canterbury, Archbishop Benson, there was the same recognition of the rightful authority of the existing Church of the land.

This was practicable, because between those Eastern Churches and ourselves there has never been the determined opposition, the feeling of antagonism, which there is between the Roman Church and our own. Our relation to the Roman Church is quite different from our relation to the Eastern Church; and the difference of relation compels difference of attitude.

At the time of the General Convention of the American Church, held in Baltimore in the year 1892, the question of our attitude toward Rome received much consideration. It was not brought before the Convention itself, but in the great side meeting of the Board of Missions, which included in its membership, with others, all the members of the Convention. It had not the legislative authority of the Convention, but chiefly executive authority for missionary work. Not under authority of the Church, and without recognition by the Board of Missions, some individuals had been prosecuting in Mexico a work of reformation and conversion, in the hope of saving souls from what was felt to be the unhappy condition of religious life in that land.

And in the missionary meeting before named, it was proposed by resolution that this movement, hitherto private, should be adopted and owned by the Church, be recognized as one of its missions, and should receive support from the missionary treasury. This at once brought to many minds that important

question of interecclesiastical relations. While Mexico was a possession and colony of Spain, the Church of Spain, essentially Roman, had occupation and authority. When Mexico became independent, the Mexican Church, like the American Church, became independent, and a proper National Church. But though independent of the Spanish Church, it voluntarily remained subject to Roman obedience and a part of the Roman Communion. And many felt (and I was one of them) that this was a condition which called for the very serious study of a very important question. An amendment was offered to postpone the action proposed until the question of interecclesiastical relations involved should have been considered and decided by the only body which had constitutional authority; that is, by the separate action of the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, and not as a side issue by a vote appropriating money. The effort to secure such higher consideration failed.

But the grave question, which the American Church failed to meet fully, has been decided in another manner. Pope Leo XIII., so recently called away from his labors, by decree claiming and expressing the highest authority of the Roman Church, pronounced the judgment of that Church, that the orders and ordination of the Church of England are not valid; and he so closed the door of reconciliation between the two Churches. The hopes for that, which had lived for centuries among the best men of the Roman Church in France and Germany, visionary perhaps hitherto, were now completely destroyed. And again, as in the days of Queen Elizabeth, it is the hand of Rome which has made the gulf of separation deep, definite, and permanent. Those who thought it a dim possibility that the Roman Church might make some concessions and reforms, and perhaps, in time, bring the two Churches together, must see now that this papal decision ends that possibility. Denial of our orders means denial of our sacraments, denial of our existence as a Church, and as a branch of the Church Catholic. We know that decision to be wrong, and against it we appeal to the just judgment of God; but by Rome, and those who obey Rome, it is counted infallible and irreversible. And so it takes away the possibility of interecclesiastical relations. When in the pontificate of Pius IX., the Roman Church, not content with reaffirming its positions which had called out our protest in the English Reformation, proceeded to make two new monstrous additions to the Creed, the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the Infallibility of the Pope, great Roman theologians in Germany and France went home utterly disheartened, and one of them, the great Bishop of Orléans, Dupanloup, declared, "We have now shut the door in the face of the Church of England." He never regained his hopefulness, and it is said and believed that he died broken-hearted.

We are compelled to accept Rome's final relation and attitude towards us, as determining our relations towards her. Had she

continued to acknowledge our Church existence and our part in the Church Catholic, or had she left it as it was until the last few years, an open question, those old principles of interecclesiastical relation might have made us considerate of her rights in the lands where she was in prior occupation. But by declining to recognize any ecclesiastical relation on our part, she has canceled our possible obligations and has set us free.

I have been speaking hitherto rather of Rome's attitude toward us, than of ours towards Rome. Let us reverse the line of view. I find our position and relation very clearly set forth in two official statements which, if they do not speak with full authority, come very near it.

The first is from the Lambeth Conference of 1867. "We entreat you to guard yourselves against the growing superstitions and additions with which, in these latter days, the truth of God has been overlaid; as otherwise so especially by the pretensions to universal sovereignty over God's heritage, asserted for the See of Rome, and by the practical exaltation of the Blessed Virgin Mary as mediator in place of her divine Son, and by the addressing of prayers to her as intercessor between God and man. Of such beware, we beseech you, knowing that the jealous God giveth not His honor to another."

And next the utterance of the House of Bishops of the American Church, which in 1878 declared the following to be "indisputable historical facts":

"First, that the body calling itself the Holy Roman Church, has by the decrees of the council of Trent in 1563, and by the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, in 1854, and by the decree of the Infallibility of the Pope in 1870, imposed upon the consciences of all the National Churches under its sway, as of the faith, to be held as of implicit necessity to salvation, dogmas having no warrant in Holy Scripture or in the ancient Creeds; which dogmas are so radically false as to corrupt and defile the faith.

"And, second; That the assumption of a universal Episcopate by the Bishop of Rome, making operative the definition of papal infallibility, has deprived of its original independence the Episcopal Order in the Latin Churches, and substituted for it a papal vicariate for the superintending of dioceses; while the virtual change of the divine constitution of the Church, as founded in the Episcopate and other orders, into a Tridentine consolidation, has destroyed the autonomy, if not the corporate existence of National Churches."

The protest against Roman error which was declared in the various steps of the English Reformation, and took definite form in the Thirty-nine Articles, and in the Book of Common Prayer, is thus reaffirmed. The errors of Rome have not grown less, but greater. The voice and action of protest must not fail. We stand in our attitude towards Rome as charging her with dangerous and almost fatal errors. We oppose those errors. We must warn

against them. We must try to save souls from them. We cannot be innocent, if we keep silent. Rome has set us free to speak and free to act; and indeed in the boldness of speech of her preachers in asserting what they believe to be her truth and assailing what they think to be our errors, they set us an example of boldness which, omitting the bitterness and abuse that too often accompany it, we might well follow. I know the popular prejudice against what is called controversial preaching. I know how our Church has seemed to shrink from it. But there are two kinds of controversy; that which speaks in bitterness, and that which speaks in love. We have no right to shrink from the latter, where it is needed.

To deny the claims which the Church of Rome wrongly urges, and to refute them, is a duty. To warn souls against them is a duty. To save souls from the superstitious practices which have grown into their worship, both public and private, is a duty. To give where we can, to souls which have been misled, what we know to be the better paths and the fuller light, is a duty. And so long as we avoid bitterness and speak the truth in love, I feel that there are not now any principles of interecclesiastical relation which should restrain or fetter us in our attitude towards Rome.

• *Second Topic.*

THE ATTITUDE OF OUR CHURCH TOWARD CHURCHES SUBJECT TO THE ROMAN OBEDIENCE.

Second Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. JAMES HEARTT VAN BUREN, D.D.,
BISHOP OF PORTO RICO.

God forbid that the "attitude" of our Church toward Churches subject to any "obedience" whatsoever should be aught save the attitude of unlimited and invincible charity. In the discussion of the present question, may God keep us from any departure from this fundamental premise.

You will not expect at this time a dissertation upon the academic aspect of the topic before us. The occasion; the events of recent history; the misgivings and doubts which are present in certain minds; the desire "to think and to do only such things as are right," which must be assumed as being in control over the conscience of this Church—all conspire to limit the meaning of our question to a simple inquiry, touching the duty of the Anglo-American Communion toward Churches of the Roman obedience in the several countries of the Western Hemisphere and the islands adjacent thereto; also in Honolulu and the Philippines.

So ably and convincingly has this question been discussed in a recent article by the Bishop of Southern Brazil, that it seems as

difficult to add to, as it is impossible to dissent from, the conclusions at which he arrives. Yet the same conclusions may be reached and re-enforced by a different method from that pursued by him in last April's number of *The East and the West*.

Our right and our duty to enter the countries and the islands above mentioned, whatever be the national flag under which their people live, can no more reasonably be questioned than our right and our duty to be present and minister the pure gospel and sacraments of our Blessed Lord in Montreal or Washington. The theory that such entrance is an "intrusion" can lead to but one logical result. That is to say, that it is our duty to withdraw from every part of the field the moment there enters an organized representative of the Vatican. For the theory of intrusion does not rest upon the accident of priority of arrival on the field. It rests, in the ultimate analysis, upon the theory of the universal supremacy of the Bishop of Rome. It postulates the exemption of the Pope from the operation of the ancient and well-established principle, that a bishop has no jurisdiction outside his own diocese.

And having entered these lands, what is our attitude? The answer is not far to seek. Our brother, the late Leo XIII. of honored memory, has given a portion of the answer, in his reply to the Anglican encyclical, denying the validity of our orders.

(1) Our attitude toward Churches of the Roman obedience is that of a member in some ancient family, whose brother has pronounced him an illegitimate son. But, abiding in the demonstrated legitimacy of our title to sonship in the family of Christ, as voiced by the encyclical of the Archbishops of York and Canterbury, our attitude is the peaceful and undisturbed attitude of Christian forgiveness toward the demonstrated fallibility of the late papal utterance, on the subject of our heritage. Rome may still dissemble her love, but she cannot prevent us from praying for her.

(2) In our attitude toward Churches of the Roman obedience, the next element is that of fidelity to the charge committed to our trust. In doctrine, discipline, order, and worship, we stand as ministers and stewards of the mysteries and of the manifold grace of God. "Moreover, it is required of stewards that a man be found faithful." We did not create, we received; we do not own, we administer; and those things which we have received and which we administer belong of divine gift to the entire human race. It is in perfect accordance with the dictates of charity that no hostility to the imparting of the treasure, no traditional withholding of word or sacraments can in any way affect *our* duty to dispense the same, freely, to whomsoever will receive them. And since we are not in the lands under consideration by the leave or permission of the Roman Church, there is no reason why we should take the wishes of that Church into the reckoning, one way or the other. Our brother has repudiated us. It is not suppos-

able that our actions interest him further. But for our *stewardship* we are accountable to Him of whom we received it, and we are accountable to Him alone.

(3) The next element in determining our attitude is the duty of discrimination. We have to deal with people many of whom hold a nominal or a real allegiance to the Roman Church. And as one of our earliest missionary bishops, on a certain occasion, spoke from Mars Hill words in which he carefully separated the true from the false in the philosophy of those Athenian citizens and strangers whom he addressed, so it is our present duty to point out, by sermon, by pamphlet, by words of private conversation, and in every other way possible, that there is a residue of Catholic truth in the teachings of Rome. It is our duty to aid the perplexed intellect in the separation of this element from the additions of Trent and the Vatican; and to stand firm for all that is primitive, true, and apostolic in the Roman system. "Charity rejoiceth in the truth."

In this element or aspect of the attitude of our Church toward Churches of the Roman obedience, we are not descending to the arena of strife. To "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints" is not well or wisely done by the weapons of controversy, whether offensive or defensive. The apostolic Church must conduct her spiritual warfare in the apostolic manner and by the apostolic method. Instead of the anathema we are employing the palm branch of righteousness and peace. In place of the rack and the thumb screws and all the other infernal devices once deemed efficacious in changing men's minds by torturing their flesh, we are employing the unanswerable argument of well-doing. Instead of the stake and the fagots we are employing the parish school and the Bible-class. As a substitute for those mediæval forms of Christian Science which seek to heal live men's diseases by dead men's bones, we employ the saner methods of the Christian hospital, and since the people of the lands under discussion are not all imbecile, we have faith to believe that these methods will commend themselves as at least worthy of a trial.

(4) Logically, the next element in our attitude is that of a strict adherence to the liturgical wisdom of our Church, adapting that liturgy, so far as may be lawful, to the necessities and limitations of those with whom we have to deal, but avoiding all that can be justly considered a mere servile imitation of the Roman ritual. It is incredible that our peerless liturgy should ever or in any place be rendered in such ways and with such accompaniments as would even suggest the Tridentine, materialistic theory of the sacrifice of the Mass. But still more inconceivable is it that this should be done in countries where it is so important to convince the intellect, the affections, and the conscience, of the difference between the original Gospel and the modern theories and inventions which have been superimposed upon it, by the depar-

tures of the Tridentine decrees from that which was committed to the Apostles. We are in possession and use of a form of worship in which St. Paul would have found himself at home. We are working, praying, preaching, worshiping, in countries where for centuries religion has been a thing of ceremonial. God forbid that we should question the sincerity of others; but our attitude toward the system which has obtained under the Roman obedience is that of insistence upon the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy, and love. To ceremonial as an outward form and expression of devotion, and as a means of inspiring thereto, we give ample scope. But we insist that creed must issue in conduct, that communion must lead to Christ-likeness, that the liturgy must lift up the life, and that the Eucharistic sacrifice must be counterbalanced by "the sacrifice of a broken spirit."

We stand in the attitude of witness-bearers in countries where the materialistic theory of the Eucharist takes expression in the festival of Corpus Christi, marked by processions in which the consecrated Host is carried aloft through the streets, and, as the *ostensorium* passes, the multitude is expected to do obeisance. We live in lands where, on Good Friday, a wax image of the dead Saviour is carried in a glass coffin to meet the wax image of the Blessed Virgin, clad in the habiliments of mourning, and borne aloft through the streets. And in that pageant, so grotesque, so unfamiliar, and so sad to our remonstrant eyes, it is easy to see the fruits of that *cultus* of the Virgin Mother of our Lord which began with a mistranslation of the Theotokos* and which accounts for the fact that her image receives more veneration than His. Here again our attitude is that of witness-bearers to the truth as the early Christians knew it, who would find themselves as entirely out of sympathy with such a demonstration as would all the disciples of all the centuries of the Christian Church which preceded the promulgation of the dogma of the "Immaculate Conception."

We are bearing the apostolic witness against these and similar demonstrations; not by violence, not by newspaper attacks, not by the hurling of harsh epithets, but by the testimony of action and life in a loyal adherence to the primitive simplicity of the pure Word of God and the apostolic traditions of His Holy Church, which distinctly declare that these things, and all the other like departures of the Roman obedience from the divine original, do form no part of true Catholic doctrine, but are "fond inventions" of men, whose minds, and whose thoughts God in His infinite mercy alone is entitled to judge. We live, however, among people many of whom declare to us that they not only have no sympathy with such demonstrations, but who even go so far as to add that they blush with shame to think that Americans are called upon to behold them.

* Not *μήτηρ Θεού*, Mother of God; but *θεοτόκος*, bringing forth of Him who is God.

The Roman obedience in so-called Latin countries is a far different thing from what it is in countries that have felt the influence of the Renaissance and the outcome of that revival in the declared principles of the Reformation movement. One of the elements of hopefulness with which we go to our work in such countries arises from the fact that already the influence of Protestant missions, public schools, and increased intelligence, is making itself felt and showing the results of the process of enlightenment and evangelization upon the Roman Churches themselves by a distinct reduction in the number of such demonstrations, by an increased efficiency in the Roman parochial schools, and by a more subdued and chastened, not to say civilized, mode of keeping the fiestas or festival days.

We live among people who have, in many instances, found the Roman additions to the faith once delivered too preposterous a strain upon their credulity, and who have taken refuge in utter and avowed agnosticism. It is our privilege, and it forms part of our attitude toward Churches of the Roman obedience, that we can show these people how beautiful is the cross when all the cobwebs of superstition and fanaticism, together with the accumulated dust of ignorance, have been removed! We are there to offer them not only "the communion of the Catholic Church," but also "the comfort of a *reasonable*, religious, and holy hope." And this we are doing in the spirit of perfect charity toward all men and with the constant prayer that He will "bring into the way of truth all such as have erred and been deceived," who has promised that, if He be lifted up, He will draw all men unto Him.

(5) The limits of this discussion create the necessity of making but one more, and final, reference to the attitude of our Church toward Churches of the Roman obedience. We stand toward them in the attitude of free men. Bound by no allegiance to any reproduction of that system which St. Paul denounced because it commanded "to abstain from meats" and forbade "to marry," we are there in the further enjoyment of the same Apostle's liberty "to lead about a wife, a sister." We are more free to devote ourselves to matters appertaining to the apostolic office, since we are under no constraint by labored argument and casuistical ingenuity, to reconcile the fact that St. Peter's successors, whether in a real or some imaginary succession, are compelled to be celibates, with the inconvenient, but authenticated fact that "Peter's wife's mother lay sick of a fever." In countries where the enforced celibacy of the Roman clergy has been productive of an impression, to say the least, not favorable to the good reputation of that prohibitory measure, it is of immense value that we are in the attitude of those who can show by precept and practice, not only that this sacramental estate is allowed of the Lord, and honorable among all men, including the successors of St. Peter, but that matrimony, like education, is one of the best and most

blessed circumstances that can possibly happen to the minister and steward of the mysteries of God.

Free from allegiance to any power which would interfere with our liberty in this particular, we stand also in the attitude toward Churches of the Roman obedience as free Christian citizens who owe no obedience to any civil power but that which our country's flag represents; or, as in the case of Brazil, to the civil power that is dominant there. It is not necessary for the purposes of this paper to enter into any question as to the exact meaning of the expression, "Roman obedience," viewed on its civil side. Enough to point out that in the civil obedience which our Church inculcates there is no such question. The undivided loyalty of the citizen to the laws of the land is a principle which enters into the attitude of our Church toward Churches of the Roman obedience, and gives us the vantage ground of entire ability to say to all the world that whatever question of casuistry may trouble others, in case decrees of a foreign ruler should ever be at variance with the laws of the country in which both we and the subjects of such a ruler are living, we are bound in our consciences only by the law of Christ, who is the Head of the Church; and in our citizenship by the law of the country in which we live, without the remotest possibility of foreign interpretation, interference, dictation, or intrusion. We are not anxious to occupy the despondent attitude of the rejected suitor, neither do we consider ourselves as some mere Protestant fly in the Roman ointment. Rather would our attitude be described as that of Sir Galahad, bending in prayer before the altar; watchful through the night shadows; eager in the pursuit of the Holy Grail, deeply conscious of the knightly accolade; but with his sword obediently "put up in his sheath," as the Lord commanded; and "whose strength is as the strength of ten, because his heart is pure."

This attitude we bear, let it be reiterated, in the spirit of Christian charity, with due regard to the dignity and the apostolic character of our Holy Church and with the fervent prayer that He who is the "Prince of the Holy Catholic Church throughout all the world" will in His own good time remove whatsoever doth hinder the coming of that unity in His wounded body, the Church, for which He prayed, and that we all may be one, even as He is one with the Father, that we all may be one in Him, by the power of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

*Third Topic.*THE DEVELOPMENT OF AUTONOMOUS CHURCHES IN
HEATHEN LANDS.*General Paper*

THE RIGHT REV. JOHN SCARBOROUGH, D.D.,
BISHOP OF NEW JERSEY

The discussion of this topic excludes, of course, all consideration of such missions as those in Hayti, Cuba, Mexico, Brazil, or the Philippines,—and I might add Honolulu and Porto Rico. For while the social and religious states of the people in those lands cannot rightly be described as “heathen,” many of them are most ignorant and degraded, and the standard of morality is very low. The Roman Church, which has for centuries held undisputed sway, and had exclusive control of the religious training of the people in most of the countries named, has lamentably failed in her mission. On the world’s map they are marked as Christian, and we therefore rule them out of our vision. In the century recently closed the Church of England and our own Church have made large missionary ventures in heathen lands, and the question suggested for consideration is one of great practical importance. Shall we continue permanently to regard our converts in heathen lands as the wards of a foreign church—an alien people—as the ancient Romans were wont to regard their conquered provinces beyond the sea? or shall we make every effort toward the growth and development of self-help, planting and watering the divine seed till it has reached the fullness and ripeness of the ear? In my own mind there is no doubt as to which is the better way.

If we search the New Testament Scriptures for models, we will find that the Churches founded by the Apostles, either were at first, or speedily became, autonomous. St. Timothy and St. Titus were put in charge of independent dioceses, with power to ordain and minister discipline. The different liturgies that have come down to us, bearing the names of Apostles or their immediate successors, are proofs positive that in that early day mission churches, as they grew and prospered, became national or independent, though still members of the one family and household of which Christ was the head. And while the conditions that prevailed in that early age of the Church were not precisely analogous to those of our own day, yet there are certain great fundamental principles that remain unchanged and are common to every age alike. Though I cannot speak of foreign missions

from personal experience, it has been my good fortune to be in close touch with the work and the workers in heathen lands for the past quarter of a century.

Perhaps a brief sketch of the missions we have undertaken will best evidence my hope and firm belief in their ultimate achievement of independence. I will not venture to discuss the missions of the Church of England that now circle the earth like a bright zodiac of light, because I am not as familiar with them as with our own—though I might safely predict the grandest results for a Church that has converted New Zealand and is now winning Uganda. She will continue multiplying sees, and founding churches, in every quarter of the globe far beyond our wildest dream for our own feeble effort. Our chief interest, as you know, centers in China, Japan, and Africa, and my contention is that in each of these three points our aim should be the founding and building up of a National Church, with its native ministry, and in communion with that portion of the Church Catholic to which we belong.

It was a bold venture of faith when, in the first half of the nineteenth century, our Church determined to enter upon the work of foreign missions. With a widespreading territory at home, rapidly filling up with a population that needed to be trained and molded in citizenship as well as in religion—some asked the question, "To what purpose is this waste?" Results have proved that there was no waste, but a far-seeing wisdom whose reaction has been stimulating and healthful.

When Bishop Boone was chosen and consecrated for China, in 1844, every effort was made by family and friends to dissuade him from undertaking what in their eyes seemed a wild and hopeless venture. Why go so far away when the need at home is so pressing and so great? And besides all this the gates of China are closed—barred and bolted—against the admission of foreigners. The brave young missionary was unshaken in his purpose, and answered these pleadings in words that deserve to be remembered: "If I am permitted only to oil the hinges of the gates of China, so that some other hand may open them, I will be quite content." He lived to see China wide open, and, what is more, he was privileged to admit to holy orders native Christians of his own training. The little company of converts gathered into the fold by that first bishop has been multiplied many times. The little one has literally become, not only a thousand, but thousands. In the half century and more that has intervened since that first faint beginning was made on the soil of China we have learned much about the life and habits of that wonderful people. We have learned, for instance, that China makes learning the sole condition of social or political preferment. The scholar is the nobleman. Family and fortune count for little in competition with knowledge. And while we may judge their methods as effete compared with our own, we

must not forget that they were hoary with age when the aborigines roamed at will over this fair land and the white man had not yet set a foot upon it. We have learned that we must meet the disciple of Confucius on his own ground, and deal with him from the standpoint of his own philosophy. We must not regard him as void of understanding, nor assume that he is in utter ignorance, to be dealt with as a child. As a people the Chinese are slow in adopting new things. To their apprehension the old is better. But, when once they are convinced, and won for the truth, they remain steadfast and unshaken. To illustrate this strong characteristic of the race, let me state a fact that deserves to be more widely known. During the recent Boxer uprising, which was aimed chiefly against Christians, whether native or foreign, not one convert, as far as our Mission Board has been informed, denied the faith to save himself from torture and death. Surely such a record gives hope and promise for the future of that infant Asiatic Church. We have in China two bishops and a goodly number of helpers, men and women of consecrated life, laboring with apostolic zeal—and, thank God—with a good degree of apostolic success. We have a college at Shanghai, filled to overflowing with the flower of Chinese youth. There are other schools for both sexes, hospitals, homes, and churches in goodly number. I have no doubt at all that before many generations have passed the infant Church in the Yangtse Valley will be a self-supporting, self-governing, autonomous body, a branch of the true vine. But we must not grow impatient. We must pray and give and bide the Lord's time, for with Him a thousand years are as one day!

What shall I say of Japan—that miracle of our day? I was a youth in college when Commodore Perry was sent by the Government of the United States to order her ports opened to the commerce of the world. Up to that date Japan was a sealed book, living within her own stronghold and shutting out other nations. It is hard to realize the wonderful changes wrought in half a century by that enterprising nation. They have railroads, telegraphs, and telephones in every quarter of their land. They have a public-school system based mostly on ours, though excelling ours in some respects. They not only carry their youth through the primary departments of education, but through the university course, free of charge. Her soldiers fought beside our own, as well as with the soldiers of other countries, in defense of human rights, against a nation near of kin. Her navy, built and manned by her own sons, has won fame and victory on the seas.

For Japan old things have passed away. Her idols have gone to the owls and the bats. Her commerce has expanded. Her wealth has grown marvelously. Her statesmen are enlightened. Her laws are just and liberal, but her future in things pertaining to God no one can foretell. Her great prosperity in worldly things may blind her eyes. Our mission work there has made

rapid progress. Many good men have laid down their lives for it. We have two active bishops, and two on the retired list residing there, besides a noble body of missionaries, men and women. We have schools of every grade, hospitals, asylums, churches, and everything needful for carrying on their work, except more nurses and more men. Japan has already established a national Church, the framework of that which time will develop and strengthen. There are native priests, some of them graduates and honor men in our American Universities, who are even now well fitted to be leaders of their people in things spiritual. Surely where there is so much to give encouragement in the present, there need be little anxiety about the future. The Church of England and our own Church will one day join in consecrating Japanese Bishops for a Japanese National Church.

The conditions in Africa do not promise speedy results. There is not the same foundation to build on as in China and Japan. A race sunk deep in barbarism and oppression rises slowly. The Republic of Liberia, founded by the Negroes colonized from this country, has been a strong bulwark against the cruel slave-trade, and has made some inroads on the tribes of the interior. When I studied my geography as a schoolboy, the whole interior of Africa was marked as the great Sahara desert. Now that unknown land has been reclaimed for civilization, and literally blossoms as the rose. While the portion of Africa where our Church claims jurisdiction is hardly more than a narrow strip along the coast line, there are other influences, molding and shaping the destinies of the Dark Continent, so that once again Ethiopia will stretch out her hands to God, and the glories of St. Augustine's day will be revived. The race that can produce a Crowther, a Holly, and a Ferguson, must have in it elements of greatness, waiting for the time and the occasion to call them out. The labors of Payne, Auer, and Hoffman were not in vain. Our bishop and his band of helpers are doing their best. There is no ground for discouragement, but rather for thanksgivings. The promised day will come, the day of Africa's redemption, though we may think it late in coming.

From this brief inventory of the missions we have established in heathen lands I am firmly convinced that we are laying the foundations of National or Autonomous Churches. They may need our nursing care for a good while, and the exercise of great wisdom in guiding them and guarding them against perils. When I think of all that has been accomplished in a brief space of time I am led to wonder, not that so little, but so much has been done. We have sent out hardly more than a picket guard to do the work of an army. If our faith had been stronger, and our gifts larger, the results would have been greater in proportion. Thank God, the need of apologizing for missions to heathen lands no longer exists. Missionary knowledge and missionary zeal are both growing apace, and the outlook is full of promise. If those intrusted

with the conduct of our missionary affairs should have a clear vision of the possibilities that now seem so promising, they will not hold any mission in leading strings too long, nor continue to hold it in a subordinate or dependent place when it is strong enough to stand alone. The mother-bird compels her young to quit the nest, that they may learn betimes to strengthen their wings by using them. So may the Church encourage her missions to self-help, and like him who conquered many kingdoms, and sighed for others still to conquer, so may the Church not rest content with any partial measure of success, nor slacken her efforts, till every listening ear has heard the good news, and every eye has seen the salvation of our God! The great question for us to consider, says one, is not so much whether God will save the heathen, as whether He will save us if we neglect our duty to them and leave them in spiritual darkness, without a prayer, or an effort in their behalf.

Thus far I have based my hope and my argument on conditions now existing in the mission field, from a mere business stand-point—so many men, so much money expended, and results measured by the means employed. But I am sure there is a higher view and a grander hope, which no human arithmetic can compute. The promise of the Father to his dear Son is all-embracing. "I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." With this sure promise and covenant in mind, we must not overestimate the importance of human agencies, nor lean too confidently on the arm of flesh. We must not be discouraged nor lose heart when our best efforts fail, but look up and on with steady gaze and strong faith for the fulfillment of the promise. In our methods of teaching is there not great danger of undervaluing or quite overlooking the divine element, whether at home or abroad, for the work is one and the same, call it by what name you will. When men, pricked in their hearts and convinced of sin, came to the Apostles, crying out almost in despair, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" the instant reply was, "Arise and be baptized and wash away your sins." If such men came to us in this day of grace asking such questions, would we not put them on long probation, and counsel them to wait for further instruction and clearer knowledge, asking them to do, without the strengthening and enlightening of the means of grace, and outside of the Church, what only can be done by the help of divine aids? When the net was let down for a draught by the command of Christ, it was found to contain fishes good and bad, and the separation was not to be made till the shore was reached. Let the Church of to-day copy such an example, and my word for it, men will flock to her open doors, not in feeble little bands, but in great, thronging multitudes.

Bid them come in their weaknesses and failings, helping them and holding them up, if they are willing to take but a single step,

and that their first step in Christian believing and Christian living, not demanding at the outset perfect faith and perfect knowledge, leaving something for the future and for the grace of God to do, presenting the Church, not as a snug harbor for the saints, but as a place of refuge for the sin-sick and weary. Bid men come, and forbid them not, if they are willing to make an honest effort. I am not pleading for a lower standard of Christian duty. I long to see the Church, both at home and abroad, more grandly fulfilling her mission in the world, touching the lives of men at every point of contact and molding for the service of the Master all sorts and conditions of men. I am waiting and longing for another Pentecost, an out-pouring of the Holy Spirit, when the eyes of Jews and Gentiles shall be opened to see the wondrous things of God's law. When that day comes the question we are considering will be fully answered. The heathen will be safely folded in the Kingdom and Church of Christ, partakers of the benefits of His Cross and Passion and the glorious hope of the Resurrection. The little company of communicants gathered out of the great company of the unbelieving in China, Japan, and Africa, will be multiplied by thousands. The Gospel must first be preached to all nations, before the end comes. Let us see to it that we are doing our full share, preparing the way, and so hastening the day of the Lord's coming.

The imperative limitations of this paper have left me no leisure to speak on one aspect of this subject which yet is of primary importance. One cannot conceive of the development of Autonomous Churches in heathen lands apart from the question of those religions which the Church finds when it goes to heathen lands. They are Pagan religions; but, none the less, some of them enshrine great truths; and the example of St. Paul, as recorded in the seventh chapter of the book of the Acts of the Apostles, may well be borne in mind by the missionary of the Church to-day. With a fine intuition, do we say? nay, rather, with a divine inspiration, he seized upon a truth which he and the worshipers on Mars Hill held in common; and, from that, built up his irresistible argument. It is a lesson which the Christian missionary sorely needs to-day; for there is an enduring witness in man, speaking, often, in and through darkened rites, and Pagan speech. It is the witness of the divine in the human heart! To that Christ spoke, and so, if we would build up His Church in Pagan lands, must we!

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

Fourth Topic.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNIAT CHURCHES IN OUR OWN COUNTRY.

General Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. ARTHUR C. A. HALL, D. D.,
BISHOP OF VERMONT.

The topic on which I am bidden to write a short paper, by way of opening a discussion, is entitled "The Development of Uniat Churches in Our Own Country." Under this I take it for granted it is specially intended to consider such a request as that presented to our House of Bishops, by Bishop Kozlowski, of the Independent Polish Catholic Church, that he and his Church may be recognized as in full communion with us, while they retain service books in their own language and with their own rites, the Bishop exercising jurisdiction over Polish clergy and lay-people wherever they may be in this country, in entire independence of our diocesan lines.

Bishop Kozlowski and his friends claim such recognition on the ground of his consecration by Old Catholic Bishops in Europe, whose orders are unquestioned, and on the ground that he and his followers comply with the terms of the Chicago-Lambeth "quadrilateral,"—accepting the Scriptures as the supreme authority, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as a sufficient statement of Christian belief, administering the two great Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper according to Christ's institution, and possessing the Historic Episcopate.

1. Now first of all I feel bound to renew the protest (which I have entered on previous occasions) against the common misinterpretation of the Chicago-Lambeth quadrilateral, which crops up continually in reference to various schemes for reunion. The acceptance of the four points was laid down, not as a *maximum* beyond which nothing more should be required for intercommunion, but as an irreducible *minimum*, about which there must be agreement before there could be any useful discussion of minor points of difference. The Report of the Committee on Christian Unity, adopted by the American House of Bishops in the General Convention of 1886, speaks of these four conditions "as inherent parts of the sacred deposit . . . of Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, . . . and therefore as essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom."*

* "Journal of General Convention," 1886, pp. 79, 80.

In the resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1888, and in the encyclical letter, these four conditions are spoken of as "articles which supply a basis on which approach may be, by God's blessing, made towards Home Reunion."*

It evidently was the intention of the Bishops both at Chicago and at Lambeth to reduce points of difference as far as possible, and to emphasize with all clearness the necessary fundamental conditions of union; but they certainly did not pledge themselves nor the Church to admit at once to full intercommunion any religious body which might express its acceptance of these fundamental conditions, some of them, like "The Historic Episcopate," certainly open to divers interpretations.

2. This leads to the second point that I would emphasize. "The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church," whatever adaptation it may have been intended to cover, cannot commit us to a practice unhistorical and un-Catholic—of overlapping systems of Episcopal jurisdiction, a sort of Episcopalianized Congregationalism on a large scale! The primitive and Catholic idea of the Episcopate is not only that Episcopal ordination provides a line of duly commissioned ministers; but that Episcopal government furnishes a center of unity for the Christian Church. It is not the fact of having chief ministers called Bishops, nor even of such Bishops being able to trace their commission in due succession to the Apostles, that constitutes the Historic Episcopate. According to the primitive and Catholic idea, the Bishop is the chief pastor within a certain district, ideally of all Christian people, certainly of all who are in communion with him. He is thus the center of unity for his own flock, and the link binding them to the wider communion of the national, and through this to the universal Church.

"A single Bishop to each Diocese, and a single Diocese to each Bishop" sums up the ancient rule.† (The position of Co-adjutors or Suffragans, who have a *delegated* authority, is not in question.) This is how St. Cyprian puts it:

"But one Bishop in a Church at a time, and one judge as the vicegerent of Christ."‡

The rule, and its "great end and design, to prevent schism and preserve the peace and unity of the Church," is fully discussed by Bingham in his "Antiquities,"§ also by Bishop Bilson in "The Perpetual Government of the Christian Church."|| Both refer to the eighth canon of the Nicene Council which, in providing for

* Davidson's "Reports of the Lambeth Conferences," pp. 272, 288, 334, 336.

† Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, "Bishop."

‡ Bk. II., ch. xiii.

§ "Ad Cornelium," Ep. lix. 6.

|| Ch. XIII.

the return and reconciliation of Novatian Bishops, expressly guards against the anomaly of two Bishops in one city.*

This, again, is a principle of wide application which seems to be frequently lost sight of. It is not the fact of a person being in Episcopal orders which constitutes him a judge in questions of discipline, or qualifies him for the office of Visitor to a Religious Community, or empowers him to grant dispensations, or perform rites of benediction. The authority not of *a* Bishop, but of *the* Bishop, the *persona ecclesiæ* in that district, is required for such purposes. To avoid confusion of ideals it would seem to me better under ordinary circumstances, and where the ministry of a Bishop is not absolutely required, that a Presbyter should be commissioned by the Diocesan to act for him in such cases when he is unable to act in person, rather than that another Bishop should seem to be acting on the inherent authority of his Episcopal office, instead of as a mere delegate of the Diocesan, from whom alone he can receive any commission for really Episcopal acts.

3. Historical precedents are sometimes pleaded for overlapping jurisdictions. But examination of the cases cited show the contention to be really worthless.

(a) The supposed existence, with apostolic sanction, of a Jewish and a Gentile Church at Rome and Antioch, each with its own Bishop, has no historical proof. Bishop Pearson, having once held the theory, afterwards abandoned it.† The supposition is extremely improbable, seeing that it is clean contrary to constant Pauline teaching, *e. g.*, in the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians. How would the proposal for separate ecclesiastical organizations for men of different race, or color, or language, have struck the Apostle who declared that in Christ and His Body "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free"? (Poles, I suppose, might very well be a gloss, if not a marginal reading, for "Scythians.")

As Bishop Gore says in his "Exposition of the Epistle to the Ephesians,‡" "It is not too much to say that the now popular principle of the free voluntary association of Christians in societies organized to suit varying phases of taste is destructive of the moral discipline intended for us. It was the obligation to belong to one body which was intended as the restraint on the prejudices and eccentricities of race, classes, and individuals. If Greeks, Italians, and Englishmen are to be content to belong to different Churches; if among ourselves we are to have one Church for the well-to-do and another for 'labor'; . . . where does the need come in for the forbearance and long-suffering, and hu-

* See Bright's "Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils," p. 32.

† Bingham, Vol. I. p. 156.

‡ P. 162.

mility on which St. Paul insists as the necessary virtues of the one body?"

(b) The later cases (in the fourth century) where proposals were made for a joint Episcopacy, as by the North African Bishops to end the Donatist schism, and by St. Meletius to end the tangle of the Eustathian schism at Antioch, are irrelevant for our purpose. As seeming exceptions they really bear witness to the rule of a single episcopate jurisdiction over all Christian people within a given area. The Catholic Bishops offered as a temporary expedient to share their Sees with the Donatists. Mel-etius implored Paulinus to "join their flocks, and dispute no longer about primacy and government, but feed the sheep in common and bestow a common care upon them."* Both these offers (neither of which was accepted or acted upon) differ fundamentally from the proposal which I have ventured to take as an illustration of a "Uniat Church" in our country. Both in Africa and at Antioch what was proposed was a merely temporary expedient, devised for the lifetime of the existing prelates. Bishop Kozlowski, I understand, asks for a permanent arrangement; certainly this would be the object of any similar demand for Negro Bishops for Negro congregations.

4. History, then, affords no sanction for the establishment of Uniat Churches. Nor (it is important to note) would the position we are asked to accord to Bishop Kozlowski and the Poles be parallel either to the case of the Old Catholics in Europe or to so-called Uniat Churches within the Roman Catholic communion.

(a) The Old Catholics in Europe are forced, or consider themselves forced, into a position of revolt from the Church of the country and its appointed rulers, by the denial of communion and the privileges of the Church, save on unlawful and un-Catholic terms. Theirs, they claim, is a case of justifiable separation, the sin of schism resting on those who refuse communion, save on unjustifiable conditions.

Bishop Kozlowski's own plea shows that, whatever may have been the mind of his consecrators (about whose "unfriendly" action there can be no doubt), he at any rate recognizes our Catholic position, or he would not seek communion with us, and that we are not seeking to impose unlawful conditions, for he claims that he complies therewith.

(b) On the other hand the position that we should create (if we agreed to this request) would be entirely different from that of so-called Uniat Churches within the Roman Communion.

(a) Whatever overlapping of Episcopal jurisdiction may be involved in these cases, all are subject to the central and supreme authority of the Pope, and are thus held in a certain unity. The existence of Uniat Churches is only one instance of the overriding

* Bingham, Vol. I., p. 154, Puller's "Primitive Saints and the See of Rome" (3d ed.), pp. 338-341.

by the Pope of the legitimate authority of the Bishops, who are practically reduced to the position of his vicars. Being without papal, or even metropolitan, jurisdiction, and with the Independent Polish Catholics neither represented in, nor subject to, the General Convention, such an arrangement as is proposed seems absolutely impracticable for us.

(β .) So far as I have been able to discover, the features which are common to all Roman Uniat Churches are the privilege of a married secular clergy, and the use of their own service books. The Ruthenians (who, I suppose, correspond most closely with our Poles) use a Greek liturgy translated into Old Slavonic. The Uniat Greeks in Italy are subject to the Bishop of the Diocese, with a Vicar-General of their own, and for purposes of ordination a Bishop of the Greek Rite residing in the Seminary.*

5. There are some practical questions that must certainly be faced, before consent could be given to such a proposal as that made by Bishop Kozlowski.

(a) His case could not stand alone. A concession to the Poles would almost certainly lead to a demand on the part of the Negroes for a similar arrangement, whereby their congregations should have a Negro Bishop with separate jurisdiction over people of their race, independent of ordinary diocesan lines. Difference in color would certainly be as strong a ground for the claim as difference in language. Nor would it end here. When race and color had been provided for, difference of temperament would put in its plea for separate recognition.

(b) Another very practical matter. So far as I have been informed Bishop Kozlowski does not yet administer the Sacrament of our Lord's body and blood in both kinds, though one of his friends told me he was looking towards this.† This is a question about which we cannot be content with any sort of doubt or hesitation.

"The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself, ministered with unfailling use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him," is one of the conditions we lay down as a basis for reunion. We should absolutely stultify our whole position, if we were to weaken on this requirement. Moreover we should be estopped for what, in New England at any rate, is one great duty of the Church,—making our protest against the violation of our Lord's institution by the substitution in the Lord's Supper (quite common among Protestant bodies) of other liquids for wine. How can we insist on *real* wine with these people, if in the case of Poles or other revolting Romans we sanction the withdrawal of the cup from the people?

(c) There are other practices, such as the Reservation of the Sacrament for the purpose of worship (with the accompanying

* Addis and Arnold's Catholic Dictionary.

† Since reading this paper I have been told that Bishop Kozlowski administers Holy Communion in both kinds to some of his people, to others not.

rites of Exposition and Benediction), and the invocation of the Saints in the public and authorized worship of the Church, about which there may be doubts as to our right to refuse communion to those who cling to such devotions. For myself, whatever defense and explanation may be offered, in view of the practical effect of such customs on the minds of the mass of men, I should not hesitate at least to urge most strongly a return to really Catholic and primitive usage on both matters. We should be bound, moreover, to consider the effect on our own people of countenancing these practices in those with whom we were in full communion. Some, of course, would be grievously scandalized. A certain section, I fear, may be half-unconsciously moved to advocate the acceptance of the Independent Polish Catholic Church by the feeling that they would be strengthened in their attempt to introduce these practices amongst ourselves by being able to point to their sanction among others with whom we are in communion. If the Poles gained (which I suspect has been one not unimportant consideration) a sanction for some of their clergy to marry, and we seemed, at any rate, to authorize prayers to the saints and reservation of the sacrament for the purpose of worship, these would hardly be gains sufficient to compensate for the sacrifice of the principle of diocesan episcopacy.

6. "Is this all you have to say?" it may be asked. "Are we to reply with a simple *non possumus* to the petition of a bishop claiming to represent eighty thousand of his fellow-countrymen who are making their home in our land, who are in revolt (not perhaps very intelligent revolt) against Roman tyranny, and ask Christian fellowship from you who claim to be Catholic while not Roman? Are your ideas of becoming the Church of the Reconciliation mere empty boasts?"

No, I should say. The reconciliation must be on Catholic principles; but, provided these are really preserved, we are willing, I trust, to make generous provision for persons of divers races and tongues and temperaments. For instance, wide liberty should be allowed as to the use of service books and forms of worship, with of course the language in which the people are accustomed to speak and think; while, as regards organization, provision might be made in a diocese where a large number of these people were settled for a suffragan bishop of their own nation and tongue, who would be the Diocesan's lieutenant, recognized in the diocese as such, and he could be employed for episcopal ministrations by other Diocesans who might have similar need.

The amendments needed in the canons for such an arrangement might well be justified by the extraordinary conditions which exist in our country as we enter on this twentieth century—conditions as to the intermixture of races within a single nation or even state, unknown, I imagine, to any previous age of the Christian Church.

THURSDAY MORNING.

*Fifth Topic.*THE ATTITUDE OF OUR CHURCH TOWARD THE
PROTESTANT COMMUNIONS AROUND HER.

(a) POINTS OF UNION AND THEIR EMPHASIS.

First Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. THOMAS FRANK GAILOR, D.D.,

BISHOP OF TENNESSEE.

I quite understand that the members of the Conference need no lecture from me on the attitude of this Church towards the communions of Protestant people around us, for we are all familiar with the facts and principles that must influence their judgment on this most important subject. This paper, therefore, is presented, in order to furnish a basis of discussion and to state, if possible, the salient points in such order and completeness as may facilitate debate. It is not a sermon nor a lecture, but a statement of facts and principles from the point of view of personal experience. Inevitably, it seems to me, a Churchman's estimate of Protestantism must be largely determined by what he himself has seen and known: and, at the outset, I am glad to say that my work in the ministry has helped me to a wider, and, I hope, a fairer view of the religious faith and the religious purpose of our Christian neighbors.

It was the great Dean of St. Paul's who said, "The Episcopate represents the Christianity of history; it represents further the Christianity of the general Church, as distinguished from the special opinions and views of doctrine which assert their claims in it." And surely it is characteristic of its divine institution that the responsibilities of the Episcopate tend to widen our horizon and make it increasingly difficult to use the "universal affirmative," as Whately calls it, in our public utterances. I speak of course for myself; but I am certain that there are not a few who will agree with me when I say that there are real convictions of mine which have been re-enforced and deepened by experience, and yet have lost, by the larger responsibilities of life, the effect of negative inference. What I mean is that the old convictions have not been weakened, but only strengthened; and yet the inferences that I used to draw so readily in condemnation of those who differed with me do not appear to-day quite so sure. I count it a blessed thing that I have learned to tolerate and even to understand the positions of men who once seemed to me to be enemies of the Christian faith, and that, not because

my own vision of truth and obligation has diminished in the slightest degree, but because I realize now more keenly that truth is an ocean without shore, and that it is easier to know the truth than to define accurately what is not the truth. I have come to distrust denials and to be chary of definitions in religious belief. Of course this is an old story to the members of this house. The four great heresies of the conciliar period were the denials of Arius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, and Eutyches; and there is only one metaphysical definition in the great creed.

I beg your indulgence while I state my first impressions of Protestantism. I was born in the Church; I was brought up a High Churchman, so high that I did not believe in the validity of lay-baptism. My acquaintance with Protestant sectarianism in my boyhood and early ministry did not encourage any thought of the reunion of Christendom. I found all the sects, the Presbyterians alone excepted (I never came into contact with Unitarians until I went to college), narrow, bitter, intolerant, and even vulgar in their views of religion and their attitude toward the Church. The Baptists were afflicted with a colossal egotism, and their converted membership was only another name for Pharisaical bigotry that put the arrogance of the Romanist to shame. The Methodists, while insisting that no man who could not tell the exact moment of his change of heart could escape hell, seemed to carry with them always a deadly dislike of what they called the "King's Church," and scoffed at the place we gave to Baptism and the Holy Communion. The other sects,—and I knew most of them in Tennessee,—from the Cumberland Presbyterian, one of our foremost denominations, and the Associated Reformed Presbyterians to the T. S. I. T. S. P. B.—"Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit-Predestinarian-Baptists,"—regarded us, if they thought at all on the subject, as pseudo-Roman Catholics and indifferent to the vital elements of the Gospel, and in some respects that attitude has not greatly changed. Only four weeks ago a young lawyer came to me and said, "I have been a disciple of Herbert Spencer; but my spiritual nature has recoiled from the nescience of his conclusions. I believe in God, as revealed in Christ, and my whole being responds to that appeal. Yet I cannot say that I have experienced a change of heart in any emotional way. Have you a place for me? My friends in the other denominations tell me that I cannot join the Church until I am entirely changed in heart and life. You see, I am not changed entirely, but I want to change, and I want the Church to help me change, but the Church holds out no hope to a man like me." In Memphis, last spring, I listened to a very striking and moving address by General Booth, filled with stories that were pathetic and even thrilling; but when he reached his climax and said, "Friends, Jesus shed His blood to pay the price, and He bought from God enough salvation to go round," I felt that his view of religion was different from mine. So I say that Protestantism in the Southern

States is not to me a cheerful or rational presentation of Christianity. It too often exhibits itself as a "mutual admiration society" of converted membership.

And yet, my brethren, in spite of all this, I am not as quick to speak of heresy and schism as I used to be. There are great, tremendous facts that give me pause.

(1) That kind of preaching which seems so crude, so partial, so uncatholic to me, is to-day lifting men and women by the thousand from the mire of sin and vice into the power and purity of a new life in Jesus Christ. The instances of real and lasting reformation are too numerous in every town and city of our land for us to say that the effects of this emotional religion are transient and unreliable. "The Kingdom of God is not in word, but in power," and we dare not question the power of Protestant Christianity, which reveals itself on every side of us in the conviction of the mystery and enormity of sin, in the reality of positive goodness, in the recovery from the delusions and waste of evil, in the work for moral elevation and improvement, in the lives of charity and sacrifice, and humble devotion to the personal dominion of the Lord Jesus Christ. Protestantism is no dead nor dying force in the world. On the contrary, it is steadily increasing, both in material strength and spiritual influence. The Methodists of the United States raised a fund of ten millions of dollars for educational work within the past few years; we have seen the richest university in the West grow up in the last ten years under Baptist control and for the aggrandizement of the Baptist Church. Nearly all the leading educational institutions of the country, Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, are Protestant in their tone and influence. The religious life of this country is built up on the principle that the individual soul through Christ is in touch with God, and that the corporate life of Christianity grows out of and depends on the life and experience of the individual Christian—and that is a Protestant principle, or, rather, that is the great and fruitful principle for which, in the last analysis, Protestantism stands. As long as the Bible is the charter of Christianity, people who are bred upon the Bible will demand the rights of the individual in religion; and Protestants have been bred upon the Bible, and there are no biblical students to-day who are the equal in scholarship of the leaders in the Protestant world. I do not believe that America is in any danger of lapsing into Romanism. That system, to be sure, is persistent and unscrupulous, an organized force in politics, subsidizing newspapers, bringing to bear all the craft and machinery created by the experience of a thousand years—but its gains are not commensurate with its expenditures of effort. It cannot hold its own immigrants. The appointment of the new Cardinal in England, and the very election of the Pope show, however carefully the inside workings are guarded, that there is a growing feeling of restiveness under the Italian domination. No man, it seems

to me, can read the lesson of Cuba, Porto Rico, Mexico, Brazil, and the Philippines, re-enforced by conditions in France and Italy, without realizing that Rome does not begin to appeal to-day to the spiritual intelligence of the world as a prevailing power as it did fifty years ago. When it comes to *religion*, to the vital experience of individual conviction, this country, I believe, is increasingly non-Roman.

If this Church wishes to come closer to the hearts of the masses of American people and to contribute its message (for surely it has a message) to the better and larger understanding of Christ's truth, where it will be heard and listened to, then it ought to seek a better understanding with those Protestant bodies which comprise among their adherents nearly forty million American citizens, or almost one-half of our entire population, and which have added to the number of their actual communicants nearly three million persons in the last four years.

The Bishop of Rome has given a formal, authoritative, and final verdict (*ex cathedra*, and from his standpoint infallible and irrefutable) that our orders are invalid, and our sacramental acts without authority. It strikes me as being treason to every tradition of our history, if not to every article of our creed, for any priest or layman of this Church to take the initiative in making concessions and adopting practices with a view to possible reunion with the Church of Rome. I am ready to make every allowance for the officious and intrigant appeal to the Pope, from a few individuals of the Established Church of England to issue a pronouncement on this subject. But I maintain that the act of a bishop of a Christian church who, in our day and generation, would permit himself to go through the form of a deliberate inquiry and then publish a proclamation that the whole Church of England, with all its affiliated branches, is cut off from the true body of Christ and is apostate from the faith, has presented a spectacle of religious fanaticism unequaled since the time of Gregory XIII., who had a medal struck off to commemorate the massacre of the Huguenots in France. In an age like ours, when there is every reason for Christians to come together for the defense of the fundamental principles of the faith, I cannot imagine a public insult to a great body of Christian people more fatuous and insane than this. My hope and trust are that the intelligent masses of Roman Catholic people do not at heart indorse the policy of extreme arrogance and intolerance which their ecclesiastical leaders seem to deem necessary for the maintenance of their prestige and importance. The authorities of the Roman Church have ever been directors and rulers rather than representatives of their people; and, although they may try to-day to impress the imaginations of men by the parade of organized power and the exaggeration of ecclesiastical claims, American ideas, and, above all, the American public school, are making it impossible for their laymen to follow them with the

same blind obedience which is given in less favored countries. And in this respect Protestantism is the reverse of Romanism; for Protestant leaders do express and represent the best thought and feeling of their people. While, therefore, the Roman Catholic laity are less intolerant than their bishops and cardinals, the rank and file of Protestants are more bigoted than their scholars and teachers; in short, the hope of the reunion of Christendom is with the Roman Catholic people, and not with their leaders, while the hope of reunion with Protestantism is with its eminent men.

It seems worth while, then, for us to inquire (1) whether there are any signs in our day of a willingness on the part of our Protestant brethren to come to a better understanding with us, and (2) whether we can do anything to help on that better understanding.

It is not a question of reunion; that is a contingency so remote that it is hardly worth discussing. What Christians have to do first of all is to understand one another, and that without weak concessions, or strained explanations, or "unreal refinements on the obstinate evidence of common sense." Dr. Döllinger was right when he said that truth is better than union, and we want no union that ignores differences and hides them under ambiguities and compromises. Or, as I heard the Bishop of Missouri say once, "Farmers are always better neighbors and better friends when they keep their fences up and their stock from roaming."

But there are signs of increased good feeling and of the surrender of prejudices on every side in the Protestant world. Take, for example, the twenty letters from distinguished ministers of Protestant bodies in the *American Church Review* for April, 1890, written in response to the overture of the Chicago-Lambeth platform. Most of them admit the historical fact of the Episcopate, but demur to the claim of its Divine appointment. They express doctrinal differences also, many of them objecting to the Nicene Creed as being too brief and incomplete a statement of faith; but nothing could be better than the spirit in which the letters were written or the evident sincerity of the expressed desire for co-operation and concord. So also Dr. Sanday's report of the Conference at Oxford last year is really one of the most interesting and reassuring things I ever read. When we recall some of the controversies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it does seem that only the Spirit of God could have made such a conference with such candor and sympathetic appreciation of opposite opinions possible. Really, when we think of it, it is astonishing how much agreement there is among Christians. As Mr. Gladstone said, "There are, it may be, upon earth four hundred and fifty millions of professing Christians; there is no longer one fold under one visible Shepherd; His flock is broken up into scores, it may be hundreds, of sections. These sections

are not at peace, but at war; each makes it a point to understand his neighbors not in the best sense, but in the worst. But they all profess the Gospel, and what is the Gospel? In the old-fashioned mind and language of the Church it is expressed as to its central truths in very few and brief words; it lies in those doctrines of the Trinity and the 'Incarnation of Christ,' which it cost the Christian flock in their first four centuries such tears, such prayers, such questioning, such struggles to establish. Since those early centuries men have multiplied upon the earth; disintegration within the Church, which was an accident or an exception, has become a rule—a final, solid, inexorable fact, sustained by opinion, law, tendency, and the usage of many generations. But, with all this segregation, the answer to the question, 'What is the Gospel?' is still the same, with exceptions so slight that we may set them out of the reckoning. The central truth of the Gospel lies in the Trinity and the Incarnation—in the God that made us, and the Saviour that redeemed us. When I consider what human nature and human history have been, I bow my head before this mighty moral miracle, this marvellous concurrence evolved from the heart of discord."

And he might have added to this common acceptance of the facts of redemption the corresponding fact of agreement upon the moral life and moral ideals as the ultimate test of faith, the belief in the power and beauty of the distinctly Christian character as the sign and witness of Christian discipleship.

Again, I have already referred to the great positive element in Protestantism as the conviction of God's immediate cure for, and contact with, the individual believer. This is the solid rock which has supported Protestantism through all prophecies of failure and all the errors and extravagances of its self-assertion. God forbid that we should deny the truth of this position. In its right significance, it is the very sheet-anchor of our Christianity to-day. But as Churchmen, we know that this individualistic interpretation of Christianity is only a half truth, and that the failure to give due place to the Church and the sacraments is bound ultimately and inevitably to create a one-sided and narrow religion. In fact, we maintain that it is historically true that non-sacramental theories and systems have failed to grasp the full meaning of the Incarnation and have tended to dwarf the conception of God, to impoverish worship and to encourage a Manichean, melancholy, contracted judgment of human life. I believe that this can be demonstrated. The history of Protestantism bristles with illustrations of it.

Now one sign of our times is that men like Salmond and Milligan and Gordon and Fairbairn, and other great leaders of Protestant thought are realizing this fact. Their reverent and scholarly study of the Incarnation, to the interpretation of which they have contributed some of the greatest books of our time, has impressed them anew with the corporate and sacramental

character of Christianity, and they are making vastly more than they ever did of the objective and historical in religion and worship. It has been quite a revelation to me, although my audience may be familiar with the fact, to find how catholic and historic much of modern Presbyterian literature is, and there is hardly any literature that stands higher in learning and exact scholarship. In 1868 the Presbyterian General Assembly replied to the invitation of Pope Pius IX., maintaining that they were not out of the communion of the Catholic Church, since they accepted and believed the doctrinal decisions of the six Ecumenical Councils of the undivided Church, and only rejected certain later innovations. (See Professor Shields in Brantford's "Unity," etc., p. 83.)

A Baptist minister told me last year that his denomination in the Northern States is slowly, but surely, yielding to the demands of the new age. An incipient ritualism, he declared, is making itself manifest. The laymen are challenging the theory and practice of close communion. Dr. Whitsitt and his co-laborers have demolished the confidence in the dogma of immersion as a *sine qua non* in baptism, and last spring a prominent pastor in Cleveland preached a sermon advocating the practice of infant baptism on the ground that the children of Baptist families are straying away to the Episcopal Church. A conservative Presbyterian minister said to me a short time ago, "I am glad that your people are agitating the change of name. That name of yours has always seemed to be to many of us a bar to reunion, for really, P. E. means anti-Presbyterian, and of course we could never come together on such a name any more than we could expect you to call yourselves Presbyterians. Is it not possible for us to agree on some uncontroversial and unpartisan designation?" On every side there would seem to be among intelligent and learned Protestants an increasing respect for "the consistent conservatism of the ancient Church amid the abounding unbelief and license of the times."

These are some of the considerations which make me believe that the despairing language in Mr. Gladstone's article, which I quoted just now, is not true for our day, and that it cannot any longer be said, at least of the leaders of the Protestant denominations, that "they make it a point to understand their neighbors, not in the best sense, but in the worst."

It remains finally to say what, if anything, we can do to help forward a better understanding with our Protestant neighbors. Well, here is a case where a right spirit, a right attitude of mind count for more than all technical concessions. We can all pray at least that we may learn to be more generous and forbearing, more distrustful of loud assertions and narrow claims, more capable of entering into the ideas of others, more humble and more apt to believe that we may not have all the truth to ourselves.

We may at least emphasize the positive character of the

Church's teaching and be chary of denials. I think that the best brief statement of the Church's distinctive characteristics, as compared with other religious organizations, I ever read, was an address delivered by the late Bishop of London, Dr. Creighton on "The Positions of the Church of England." In that address he says, "The Church of England has never undertaken to define its relations to other bodies," and "The formula which most explains its position is that it rests on an appeal to sound learning." Not that it arrogates to itself the pre-eminent possession of learning, but that, when learning and the scholastic system came into collision in the sixteenth century, England had a unique opportunity of applying the results of learning calmly and dispassionately to the system of the Church, and used it so. He says, "The Church of England does not indulge in negations, but aims at setting forth the truth in a simple and dignified system, and it is this characteristic which has led to the groundless assertion that the Church of England expresses a compromise. Sound learning must always wear the appearance of a compromise between ignorance and plausible hypothesis." This is substantially what Bishop Westcott contends for when he says, "The English Reformation corresponds with the English character, which is disinclined to seek the completeness of a theological system. It looks to finding truth through life rather than through logic. It is patient of indefiniteness, even of superficial inconsistency, if only the root of the matter can be held firmly for the guidance of conduct, for spiritual subjects are too vast to furnish clear-cut premises from which exhaustive conclusions can be drawn. So we naturally turn again and again to the historic elements of our creed." I think that Dean Church has shown that this is the position taken by our greatest apologist, Hooker, and our greatest saint, Bishop Andrewes. Hooker appealed to the reason, and Andrewes appealed to the facts. As applied to our relations with other Christian bodies, Bramhall expressed it when he said in his essay on Episcopacy: "It is charity to think well of our neighbors and good divinity to take care of ourselves."

Therefore, in speaking about the characteristic doctrines of the various Protestant denominations, our clergy might be urged to abstain from the use of such terms as "heretic" and "schismatic," and they might also to be encouraged to interpret the Church's system in the direction of brotherly feeling and good will, and not for purposes of controversy and exclusion. There are some rules in the Church which seem to me to be so indeterminate as to admit of interpretation either one way or the other, and it rests entirely with the disposition of the individual clergyman as to what way he shall choose. I may refer here specifically to the rubric following the Office for Confirmation, a rubric which was drawn up in the twelfth century, and which historically cannot be proved to be intended for members of Protestant Churches

as we now know them, and this is true *a fortiori* when we recall the acts of occasional conformity under which thousands of men were obliged to receive the Holy Communion at the altars of the English Church when their faith and life were elsewhere. (Confirmation is necessary to "admit" our baptized children as communicants of the Church. To repel baptized communicants of other Christian bodies is a negative inference too large for the facts.) I do believe that this question of admitting to the Holy Communion is a serious problem in our relation with Protestant Christendom.

I do not think that the refusal to exchange pulpits counts for very much. The fact that we require the use of vestments, and the liturgical character of our services, sufficiently justifies this lack of ministerial intercourse in the popular mind.

In this connection I would express the wish that we had a recognizable type of Anglican services, so that worshipers would not be confused by a multiplicity of variations, both for the benefit of our own people and the edification of outsiders. And, for my part, I cannot but hope that some day we shall have an edition of the Prayer Book for mission use, in which the rubrics of the Prayer Book will be printed in large type and expressed in language that the American public can understand.

This matter of custom and worship is vital, it seems to me. The Protestant masses do not love us because they do not understand us. They see some of our clergymen baptizing infants without any sort of guarantee that their parents will bring them up—or permit anyone else to bring them up—as Christians (and this is contrary to the whole teaching of the Church), and they think that we regard and use Baptism as a charm. They attend our services and have none to explain them or interpret them, and they go away untouched. They see classes presented for Confirmation, of whom perhaps forty per cent. are carefully instructed, and the subsequent worldliness and irresponsibility of the others encourages them to feel that we are a "peculiar" people. They hear some good Episcopalians declare that their Church was not intended to reach the uneducated masses, and that their Church would not venture to intrude where other churches had the field; and they imagine straightway that we are confessedly without any well-defined mission to mankind. Really the first step in winning the confidence of our Protestant brethren will be to instruct and train our own people. I do not believe that there is a body in Christendom which undertakes to carry so large a load of indifferent membership as does the Episcopal Church. So much the more reason for definite instruction, and that instruction must begin with the children. It would pay the General Convention to devote a day to the consideration of the work and methods of teaching in our Sunday schools. At present the systems of Sunday-school instruction are various, and the results are far from satisfactory.

Then, again, we do not use the opportunities we have for making the Church known. We lack organization, we lack aggressiveness and unity of purpose. Even our bishops too often have to fight like skirmishers, and feel the need of more corporate relation and co-operation. The schoolbooks of the country simply reek with misstatements as to the origin and purpose of the Anglican Church. The newspapers, many of them,—perhaps most of them,—are “storm-centers of misinformation” on the subject, and we do little or nothing to counteract their influence or expose their errors. Perhaps we are too respectable to make use of the daily press to teach the people, just as we are too uncertain to set forth some authorized tracts; but it is that kind of self-satisfied aloofness from the ordinary world of men and women that breeds misconception and distrust of the Church.

Finally, I think that we ought to emphasize the fact that this Church is not the Church of the Middle Ages nor the Church of England, but an American Church. The problems we have to solve and the difficulties we have to encounter are, in a peculiar sense, our own. English precedents and English customs will help us little in these matters. There is hardly a question in theology or in ritual which will not strike the mind of a man who has breathed in the spirit of American institutions in a different way from that with which it appeals to one who lives with less confidence in an absolutely popular government. Speaking broadly, I venture to say that the essential differences between the English and the American mental attitude arise from the fact that in England the nation, with its precedents and prestige, came first, and the individual was second. In the United States the individual was first, and we are only to-day beginning to realize fully the responsibility and authority of national life. In England authority is taken for granted, and the individual is beginning to be recognized in the gradual extension of the suffrage and the slow decline and limitations of mere class control. With us, on all sides there is evidence of increased recognition of the nation and national self-consciousness, as against the centrifugal forces that have been operative and tolerated in the interests of the individual. In England individualism is growing and asserting itself against prescriptive rights and entrenched conservatism of class and custom. That is why sometimes individual Englishmen are, in our opinion, more vociferous in their assertion of rights and privileges than the individual American. The American has learned the folly of unrestricted private judgment by his own experience, and the English people have that experience ahead of them; and the time is coming when the United States will have to teach England to be sober-minded. This may seem to be a paradox, but when I read Dean Freemantle’s “explanations” of the virgin birth of our Lord and the defense of them in the *Contemporary Review*; when I read

the appeal to the English clergy to be considerably loyal to the Anglican Church, by men like Dr. Darwell Stone and Dr. Newbolt, I am satisfied that our individualism, compared with that of England, is "as moonlight unto sunlight, as water unto wine." English churchmanship to-day is handicapped by the almost fanatical strife of two sets of extremists in religion, one school declaring that the English Church is but one section,—one province,—of the Roman obedience, which is bound, by every Catholic tradition, some day, to submit to the Papal claims, and the other school, following the lead of Matthew Arnold, frankly avows, to quote the language of one of its leaders, that the old formulæ must be completely laid aside or else inevitably change their meaning, and that this is the only basis of "national union for religious purposes." That is a definition of the Christian Church to give us pause. It is a national union for religious purposes.

I cannot but deprecate the introduction into the Church in this country of methods and habits of thought and custom which are, it seems to me, entirely foreign to our history and character. We have no established Church; our people are not yet accustomed to the defined separation of classes. The democratic principle is still the foundation of the State. For us, then, to import into this Church the manners and customs, the prejudices and parties of the Established Church of England, seems to me to be a mistake. Romanism has tried in vain to be Roman in the United States, and is now attempting to convince people that it is the American Catholic Church. No body of Christians ever had the splendid opportunity that we have to demonstrate that "Catholicity" does not mean "Romanism," and that "American" is not synonymous with class individualism; but we shall not do it as a branch of the Church of England, only as an American Church. The political events of the past five years have educated our people up to the appreciation of a larger conception of the nation and a more sympathetic understanding of the place of authority in government. The very principles for which the Church has contended for a hundred years on this continent are coming to be the accepted principles of our national life. Let us teach these principles, then, not as an alien and foreign importation, but as legitimate and logical developments of American institutions. Our appeal to Protestantism is Disraeli's appeal to the Jews—not that they be converted and changed, he said, but, as the Apostle Paul put it, that they become "complete in Him." Or, as Professor Maurice used to say, the true and vital principles of Protestantism can be shown to be Catholic principles.

As an American Church, we have, I repeat, an exceptional opportunity of contact and sympathy with the great Protestant world, which may be encouraged by the maintenance of our American spirit and American independence in custom and wor-

ship and government. I believe that it is God's own plan to shape history of the progress of variously contrasted types of human nature and to make their differences a divine method of culture and development. To recognize those differences of racial and national progress is to fall in with His design. To disparage or ignore them, as Rome has tried to do, is (as Martineau says) "to try to be more Catholic than God."

THURSDAY MORNING.

Fifth Topic.

THE ATTITUDE OF OUR CHURCH TOWARD THE PROTESTANT COMMUNIONS AROUND HER.

(a) POINTS OF UNION AND THEIR EMPHASIS.

Second Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. JAMES CARMICHAEL, D.C.L.,
BISHOP COADJUTOR OF MONTREAL.

This subject is of a very wide character, my paper is not to exceed twenty minutes; hence the cut-and-dried conciseness of what I have written.

It would be folly to endeavor to note the points of unity between Anglican communions and the widespread organizations of those outside of such communions. I therefore select out of many the two greatest Protestant communions in Canada, and I suppose in the States—the Presbyterian and Methodist—and proceed to show, first, where we positively agree, and, secondly, where we closely approach agreement.

My authorities are the recognized standards of each communion: *Presbyterian*, the Westminster Confession, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and the Apostles' Creed regarded as a summary of the Christian faith, agreeable to the Word of God, and anciently received in the churches of God. *Methodist*, the Twenty-five Articles of Religion, the fifty-two Sermons of Wesley, the Notes of Wesley on the New Testament and the Catechisms.

A comparison of these standards with those of the different branches of the Anglican communion shows actual unity of belief in the following doctrines:

(1) The Being of God; (2) The Holy Trinity; (3) The Divinity and Work of the Lord Jesus; (4) The Person and Procession of the Holy Ghost; (5) The Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures; (6) Justification by Faith; (7) Good Works.

A like comparison shows a very close approach of unity of belief with Anglicanism on the following subjects:

THE CHURCH.

Methodist.—The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men in which the pure Word of God is preached and sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all things that of necessity are requisite to the same. (Article XIII.)

The definition is identical with that of the Nineteenth Article of the Church of England, save that the clause on erring churches is omitted.

Presbyterian.—The invisible Church, which is catholic, consists of the whole number of the elect; the visible, which is also catholic, consists of all throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children. Of this Church there is no other head but Jesus Christ. To this Catholic Visible Church Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, etc. (Confession, Cap. 25.)

With regard to the authority and discipline of the Church these two bodies teach as follows:

Methodist.—In Catechism 2, and in the Baptismal Service and Ordination Service, the Church is styled, "the Holy Church," "the Holy Catholic Church," "Christ's Holy Church," "Congregation of Christ's Flock," "the Household of God," "the Church of God," "the Church Militant," "the Spouse and Body of Christ." Article Twenty-two, on the "Rites and Ceremonies of the Church," is practically identical with Article Thirty-four of the Church of England on "The Traditions of the Church." The word Traditions is omitted, but otherwise the Article is practically unchanged. Under the laws of Methodist discipline, offending ministers, probationers, local preachers, and laymen or women are liable to be tried, and, if necessary, excommunicated.

The Presbyterian Church teaches belief in "the Holy Catholic Church," "the Catholic or Universal Church," "the Visible Church," "The Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ," "the House and Family of God."

In its Confession (30) it teaches that the Lord as King has appointed a government in the hands of Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate. To these the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are committed, they having power to retain and remit sins, to shut the Kingdom of Heaven against the impenitent, both by word and censures, and to open it to penitent sinners by the word of the Gospel and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require. Church censures are necessary for the honor of Christ, etc., and to attain these ends the officers are to proceed by admonition, suspension from the sacrament, or by excommunication.

THE SACRAMENTS.

In comparing the standards of the two bodies on the general subject of the sacraments with the Anglican definition in Article

Twenty-five we find literal verbal agreement between Methodist and Anglican definitions, save that the Methodist Article omits redundant words, and changes the word "damnation" into "condemnation."

Presbyterian.—Defines sacraments as holy signs and seals of the Covenant of Grace, instituted by God to represent Christ and His benefits, and to confirm our interests in Him. That there is in every sacrament a spiritual relation or sacramental union between the sign and the thing signified. That the efficacy of a sacrament depends upon the work of the Spirit and the words of institution. (Chap. 27.)

BAPTISM.

Methodist.—Defines baptism as "a sign of regeneration," or new birth. (Article XVII.)

Presbyterian.—Defines baptism as a sign and seal of the Covenant of Grace, of engrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins. It also states that regeneration is not confined to baptism, nor does it assert that all baptised are regenerate, but such reservation implies that, as a rule, regeneration accompanies baptism. (Confession 23, Directory.)

Both systems agree with us in regarding the regeneration of baptism as an influence of divine grace.

Presbyterian.—"There is a grace in baptism." "That we should be humbled for falling short of the grace of baptism." (Larger Catechism, 167.) In the Directory for Public Worship, prayer is ordered to be made that God would join the inward baptism of the spirit with the outward baptism of water, making it to the infant a seal of adoption, remission of sin, regeneration, and eternal life.

Methodist.—In Cat. 2 the following question is asked:

"What is the inward and spiritual grace of baptism?"

"Our being cleansed from the guilt and defilement of sin, and receiving a new life from and in Christ Jesus."

In Wesley's eighteenth Sermon he says, in speaking to those fallen:

"And if ye have been baptised, your only hope can be this, that those who were made children of God by baptism, but are now children of the devil, may receive again what they have lost, even the spirit of adoption crying in their hearts. 'Abba, Father.'"

With regard to the baptism of children, Methodism (Article XXVII.) declares: "The baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church that all children, by virtue of the unconditional benefits of the Atonement, are members of the Kingdom of God, and therefore entitled to baptism." (Discipline, 55.) Presbyterianism teaches "that the children of such as profess the true religion are members of the Visible Church" (Confes-

sion, 25; Cat., 62); that "the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized." (Confession, 28; Cat., 166.)

This practical refusal of baptism to the children of unbelieving parents must, I fancy, be tided over in some way in the widespread and successful missionary work of Presbyterianism.

SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

That this sacrament is a positive means of grace.

Methodist.—That through sacraments as signs of grace God doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken but also strengthen and comfort our faith in Him. (Article XVI.) That when taken by the faithful the Lord's Supper "strengthens and refreshes souls"; that it is "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace" (Cat., 2); and that "in such as worthily receive, it has a wholesome effect or operation." (Article XVI.)

Presbyterian.—"To believers, the Lord's Supper is a sealing of all the benefits of the sacrifice of Christ unto their spiritual nourishment and growth in Him." (Confession, 29.) "That by the working of the Holy Ghost and the blessing of Christ sacraments become effectual means of salvation." (Larger Catechism.)

WORTHY RECEPTION.

Methodist.—"To such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the Supper of the Lord, the bread which we take is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ." "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, and the means whereby it is received and eaten is faith." (Article XVIII.)

Presbyterian.—"The outward elements" "have such relation to Christ crucified, as that truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, albeit in substance and nature they still remain truly and only bread and wine, as they were before." "Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death, the body and blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine, yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to the outward senses." (Confession, Cap., 29.)

"Worthy receivers are, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by faith, made partakers of His body and blood, with all His benefits, to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace." (Shorter Catechism, 2, 96.)

ABSOLUTION.

Presbyterian.—“That the Lord Jesus as King, etc., hath appointed a government in the hands of Church officers, etc. To these the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power, respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that Kingdom against the impenitent, both by word and censures, and to open it unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the Gospel, and by absolution from censures as occasion shall require.” (Confession, C. 30, 1 and 2.)

Methodist.—Methodism seems devoid of all teaching with regard to the ministerial power of absolution; but the principle of declaratory absolution lies at the very root of the practical working of Methodism, inasmuch as ministers declare publicly, as the result of every camp and revival meeting, that so many individuals, having acknowledged their sins, are converted and are hereby publicly declared as pardoned. In the case of erring ministers, local preachers, and laity, pardon can only be obtained after confession of sin, etc. (Discipline, p. 132.)

FASTING.

Presbyterian.—That religious fasting is a duty arising out of obedience to the second commandment. (Larger Catechism, 108.) That it demands total abstinence from food, except in cases of bodily weakness. That it should be observed in times of public judgment, or when special blessings are sought. (Directory); and that at ordinations the congregation which he that is to be ordained shall serve is recommended to keep a solemn congregational fast previous to the day of ordination. (Form for government.) Besides general fasts of the Church, enjoined by authority, congregations and families may observe days of fasting. (Directory.) It is customary, in some parts, to observe a fast before the Lord's Supper, etc., and as these seasons have been blessed to many souls, etc., those who choose it may continue the practice. (Directory.)

Methodist.—Those desirous of continuing members shall fast. (General Rules, 43.) Fasts should be observed in every society on the Friday preceding each quarterly meeting. (Rules, 177.) Ministers and probationers should fast every week as health permits. (Rule 199.) Ministers should constantly ask themselves: “Do we know the benefit and obligation of fasting? How often do we practice it? The neglect of this alone is sufficient to account for our feebleness of spirit. We are continually grieving the Holy Spirit of God by the continual neglect of a plain duty.” (219.)

ON DIRECTING THE CONGREGATION IN PUBLIC PRAYER.

Presbyterian.—From 1560 to 1645 Presbyterianism used the Liturgy of John Knox, modeled after the Genevan liturgy. Then

came the arrest of liturgical services through the adoption of the Directory for Public Worship. This Directory aimed at obtaining a measure of uniformity, not by issuing the actual words of prayer, but "the general heads or topics for petitioning, outlined supplications," leaving it to the minister to use his discretion as to words; in short, giving the godly man who possessed the gift of language "the help and furniture of thought." The prayers are outlined at some length, and, from the directions given, it is clear that the minister was in duty bound to touch on all the subjects given him. In secret and private worship a set form of prayer is allowed to be used under certain conditions—inability to put words together, etc.

In baptism these topical directions are very full. Directions are given for the administration of the sacrament, the use of the baptismal words enjoined, and a choice given between pouring and sprinkling.

Lord's Supper.—In the administration of the Lord's Supper the service taken part in by the minister, the prayers used, etc., are fully outlined, and he is commanded "to bless the elements by the words of institution and prayer, and to break the bread and hold the cup whilst using the divine words."

Marriage.—The general character of a marriage service is outlined for the minister, and the couple are joined together by a clear form of words repeated by them after the minister.

Methodist.—Methodism authorizes liturgical services for baptism; the Lord's Supper, marriage, burial, ordination—all of which are taken from the services enjoined by the Church of England. In addition to these are services for (1) Reception of Members, (2) Renewing the Covenant, (3) Laying the Corner Stone of a Church, (4) Dedicating a Church.

ORDINATION.

Presbyterian.—The act of ordination consists of the imposition of hands and prayer, in which God is implored "to fit" the candidate "with His Holy Spirit, to fulfill the work of the ministry in all things, that he may both save himself and the people committed to his charge." Previous to the act the candidate is publicly examined, theologically and personally.

Methodist.—Those about to be ordained are examined as to whether they "think they are moved by the Holy Ghost to preach." The minister is constituted or set apart by the laying-on of hands to conduct all parts of divine service, to baptize, administer the Lord's Supper, solemnize matrimony, etc.—the words of ordination being: "The Lord pour upon thee the Holy Ghost for the office and work of the ministry in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of

His Holy Sacraments in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

These words are used after the use of the *Veni Creator*.

I will now sum up these points of contact as I have given them.

Sacramentally.—There is agreement between the Anglicans, Methodists, and Presbyterians on the following points:

- (1) That a sacrament is a sign of grace.
- (2) That the sign is connected with a spiritual grace to the worthy receiver.
- (3) That baptism is a sign of regeneration.
- (4) That regeneration is connected with an inward grace.
- (5) That children are fit subjects for baptism.
- (6) That in baptism children receive blessings of grace.
- (7) That the Lord's Supper is a positive means of grace.
- (8) That worthy communicants feed spiritually upon the body and blood of Christ.

With regard to the Church there is agreement on the following points:

- (1) That Christ founded the Church, and that He is its Head.
- (2) That the Church so founded is visible on earth.
- (3) That all Churches are liable to err.
- (4) That the Church possesses power to execute discipline—if needs be, to excommunicate; to decide controversies, etc., in connection with faith, doctrine, and practice.

With regard to the ministry there is agreement on the following points:

- (1) That Christ instituted the ministry as distinct from the laity.
- (2) That none should minister save those called.
- (3) That Christ endows His ministry with suitable graces.
- (4) That ordination should consist of the laying-on of hands and prayer.
- (5) That the ministry has power to bind and loose; to excommunicate and declare absolution.

My subject as defined for me demands a few emphatic words based on the foregoing facts. Notice how near we are to our separated brethren, and they to us; how all that I have been reading—the definitions, thoughts, language—sound as if all had been copied out of the standards of Anglican theology. Yet, at the same time, notice how far apart we practically are from each other. Beyond certain combinations of courtesy and acts of sociability, we really have no strong links of spiritual fellowship binding us to them or they to us. And yet no thoughtful mind, I think, can ignore their power for good in the world; no one would dare to deny, or even minimize, the forceful righteousness which goes forth from them—a righteousness so forceful that every day national godliness and morality would suffer the severest blow ever dealt to it if suddenly that force were paralysed,

and that we would suffer, and suffer materially, as part and parcel of common Christianity.

And yet that force for righteousness, so near and close to us in holy doctrines and sacred teaching, is no direct aid to us, or we to it; as a rule our position toward each other being that of courteous yet definite separation. Surely it would well befit a conference such as this to take some practical step in accordance with, but in advance of, the Lambeth platform, that would awake ourselves and these great Churches outside of ourselves afresh to the fact that, as far as Anglican Communion are concerned, the unity of Protestantism is still in the field; that the sole and only object animating us in the matter is our desire, in the name of God and for His glory, to do something toward placing a stay on the rending of that Church which is "Christ's body," and that we are in earnest, sober, God-fearing earnest, to do, as a Church, all that lies in our power, seeking to view calmly our differences, and striving to realize our agreements, and from this happier standpoint of Christian feeling looking out with hope on "things that make for peace."

I hold that this conference gives us an opportunity that by God's blessing, if we use it judiciously, might lead to good results, and I would advise the passage of a resolution on the subject.

RESOLUTION.

"Resolved: The Bishops present in the All-American Conference held in the City of Washington, having had under discussion the attitude of the Church to which they belong toward the Protestant communions around them, have been aroused anew to the manifold evils of that unhappy condition of disunion within the Church of Christ with which we are everywhere confronted to-day.

"While ardently desiring the co-operation of all Protestant communions, yet having regard to the paper read before us by the Bishop Coadjutor of Montreal as to the points of agreement and disagreement (but especially the former) between our Presbyterian and Methodist brothers and ourselves, we would respectfully suggest to the General Convention of the United States, the General Synod of Canada and the Synod of the West Indies, the advisability of constituting committees to lay before the General Assembly and the General Conference the contents of that paper, and to invite them to take such other steps as by them may be deemed best to draw the attention of the several congregations to them.

"We would also affectionately commend this whole most grave subject anew to the consideration of these Protestant communions, and ask them to consider it seriously with a view to arriving at intercommunion and possible union of them and us, through the composition of some of the differences, and the

recognition that others do not constitute sufficient reasons for creating or continuing a rupture of that visible unity of the Church for which our Lord Jesus Christ prayed.

"We are very thankful to believe that, notwithstanding differences between Christians, yet because of the wide acceptance of the underlying basic principle of baptismal unity, there is good hope of the fulfillment of our Blessed Lord's high priestly prayer, which calls for constant thought and prayer and conscientious effort on part of His disciples for the accomplishment of reunion throughout Christendom.

"Believing that many of the evils now under review arise from the lack, both among our own people and others, of sufficient knowledge and proper understanding of our history and of the general principles of our organic Church, we would urge the more common use of such publications, and literature, as will tend to supply this lack."

THURSDAY MORNING.

Fifth Topic.

THE ATTITUDE OF OUR CHURCH TOWARD THE PROTESTANT COMMUNIONS AROUND HER.

(b) POINTS OF DIFFERENCE AND THEIR EXPLANATION.

First Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. CORTLANDT WHITEHEAD, D.D.,
BISHOP OF PITTSBURGH.

To begin what I have to say, I quote the following which lately fell under my eye in one of our Diocesan papers. The two paragraphs sufficiently describe the situation.

"Count the steeples in an American town. It is all very well to say that they are so many fingerposts pointing heavenwards. In reality each is the representative of a certain portion of truth, torn out of its place in the perfect circle of Catholic truth, and mangled in the process. It is often a partial, petty, and an antagonistic presentation of the Church of God. . . .

"The American people are an intensely practical people. Endowed with a large allowance of common sense, fertile in expedients, and prompt in action, they are not apt to be long tolerant of a proved absurdity. Only let the religious portion of our community become once persuaded that it is a palpable absurdity to call the existing jumble of denominations, followings, and sects, Christian Unity, they will work night and day and pray day and night until something better is brought to pass."

I believe it to be the inherently happy lot of every bishop of

the Anglican Communion to have a share in our dear Lord's Beatitude concerning the peacemakers. On this American continent there is no more bounden duty and privilege of a bishop than that he should reduce friction, dispel prejudice, impart information; throw light upon matters of difference; draw attention to points of agreement; commend the truth to men's consciences as in the sight of God, without fear or favor indeed, but at the same time speaking the whole truth in love. That will be a successful Episcopate, by whomsoever exercised, which leaves behind it a flavor of peace-loving, peace-helping ministry, tenderly and affectionately giving explanation of all points of difference. And when a number of bishops meet together to take counsel concerning the Kingdom of God, no more Christlike business can be theirs than to consider and endeavor to bring to pass the speedy fulfillment of our Lord's great prayer for unity.

No other Christian Communion has so hard a task as we. All alike, Christian bodies are contending in their measure and degree, against the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. But do I not voice the experience of all my brethren when I say that, in addition to this, the Church in our sect-ridden community must contend against an ill-feeling, against a misunderstanding, against a misrepresentation, and against a prejudice, which to us seem absurdly out of proportion to the circumstances of the case, the character of which we are conscious in ourselves, the doctrines we hold, and the attitude which the Church in her heart of hearts maintains towards our brethren of the Protestant Communions.

What shall we do to explain the points of difference? I think it may be fairly said that the original causes of divergence between the Church and the Protestant bodies around her have virtually disappeared. And, transplanted across the sea to our broad land and later times, their consistency and logic, their very *locus standi* are perceptibly going, if not already gone. We can see it on every hand, although our brethren themselves may not be conscious of it.

Historically, separation came, as we know, in large measure from political as well as theological and ecclesiastical causes, and was connected with times now reckoned as of the far past. Anyone who knows his English history will recognize that ecclesiastical or doctrinal reasons were often adopted to excuse the separation, *after* other reasons had somewhat lost their primary importance. This may be safely said of the Presbyterians and Independents, and possibly of others. The causes of the Wesleyan defection our Methodist brethren themselves would probably agree with us cannot justly be charged against the Anglican Communion to-day.

What we have to meet, therefore, can be very largely comprehended under the one word *prejudice*;—misunderstanding is a less irritating word—inherited prejudice—and prejudice on every side comes from *ignorance*, by which I do not mean anything

necessarily reprehensible. Perhaps we should rather say, a lack of information, oftentimes an inevitable lack.

The creed of multitudes of religionists to-day depends upon *accident*,—not principle. Abundant witness may be found for this statement wherever inquiry is made among ordinary Christian people for the reasons which make them adherents of one or another denomination. The *accident* of birth, the *accident* of education, an accidental friendship, or change of residence, or marriage, or pastoral attentions, or convenience of access—how many such reasons are the only reasons for ecclesiastical affinities, among our own people as among others.

Ask an ordinary attendant at any one of our hundred different houses of worship why he belongs there, what the special tenets of his denomination are and why, who was its originator, what its history, whence its authority, what its particular witness, purpose, destiny;—on what Scriptural or historic or practical grounds it separated and remains separated from others closely akin or further removed; even why he is a Protestant, and against what errors he protests; and can he tell you? Does not our own experience among men assure us that *ignorance* on all sides, unintelligent, thoughtless, inert, but bristling with prejudice, characterizes the mass of the people who profess and call themselves Protestant Christians on this American continent?

When the question is how to approach them and make friends with them, consummate wisdom is needed, as all will allow. Such in difficulty and delicacy is the problem before us to-day.

No one who really believes in the one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church as the *Ideal* can fail to regard the Dispersion as most lamentable. Our Prayer Book bids us remember "the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions." All separatists from the *Ideal* are indeed wandering sheep.*

Nor are these words arrogant. They assume indeed that we are right and these our brethren wrong, but how else can we have any reason to exist as a Church? Confident as we are, and as we *ought* to be, of the unshaken and unshakable position which the Anglican Communion has always maintained, we mean no disrespect to any of our Christian brethren when we say without hesitation, that we are persuaded that if they would take the time to look into the actual facts, and view our doctrine, discipline, and

* "They have fallen into a pit from which it will take some time to extricate them. But it has been ignorantly done, and not willfully. They have followed blindly in a beaten track, they have been hurried without thought into habits and ideas of religion which it is difficult now for them to shake off. We are not to judge them too severely for this . . . but we are to love them, and loving them to teach them. . . . In their inability to understand, we are to help them. In their thirst after the living water which is knowledge we are to stand at the well and draw the water for them. In their ignorance of facts and of history we are to gather together and set before them the account of those things which most nearly concern them."—*The Vicar of Frome*, "The Church's Broken Unity," and we gladly make his words our own.

worship, unaffected by prejudice, they would, if not entirely ready to acknowledge the overwhelming strength of our position, nevertheless have much cause to modify what seems to us undue irritation and antagonism concerning us.

And this we have a *right* to ask, because for the most part they went out from us three centuries ago and later. This is the Mother Church of at least all English-speaking Christians, having the advantage of them in point of age, and (taking in the whole Anglican Communion) having the advantage of many of them in point of numbers, and from another standpoint having the advantage of them in point of historic dignity and achievement. We will not claim that our Communion has the advantage of them in many spiritual qualities, in missionary zeal, in generous furtherance of evangelistic work, in sanctity of life, and in many other things which entitle these brethren to our unstinted admiration. We do not claim as *our* exclusive heritage *any* good thing which is not equally, if they will, their own. We do not boast or exult in our time and generation as if we had whereof to glory—for what have we that we did not receive? but we feel that we have the right to claim *fair treatment*, which it is not the prevalent habit to give us; and, as the older of the company, to receive kindly and unprejudiced consideration.

As to the charge of arrogance so frequently made by some of our own people as well as by our separated brethren, is the point well taken? Is it arrogant to be earnest for the truth as one perceives it? To stand firm for conviction, and outspoken in defense of one's rightful heritage, especially when the one motive is to make others joint-heirs with us and not keep the heritage to ourselves? Is the Baptist brother *not* arrogant when he accounts all pedit-Baptists unbaptized, or the Methodist when he intimates that his Episcopal brother is unconverted, or the Presbyterian when he speaks slightly of Prelacy; and *we* only blameworthy when we seek to share with others our priceless treasures? Were Aquila and Priscilla to be commended or condemned when they took Apollos, although he was mighty in the Scriptures, and sought to show him *the way of the Lord more perfectly*?

The arrogance of St. Paul on Mars Hill is ours, the arrogance of the Christian missionary in a heathen land, the arrogance of our Lord, who brought a message which men neither asked for nor believed. The word insinuates a *motive* with which this great Communion of ours can never justly be charged, nor any individual who upholds her claims. Whatever his manner or the strenuousness of his methods or words, that motive, I repeat, is necessarily a noble one—to share a blessing with others less fortunate—to bring about the Unity in the Faith for which our Saviour prayed, and to save men's souls alive.*

* Our Presiding Bishop Tuttle, just the other day in his charge to the

I believe we may safely assert that, whatever impetuous and narrow-minded individuals may have said and done, the *authoritative Anglican position* has always been perfectly Christian, and in accord with the words of the Apostle, "prove all things, hold fast that which is good."

"Even more important than unity is truth. Unity after the pattern of men, and not according to the Will of Christ, would not remedy the evils which we experience. A body having such unity would not be Holy nor Catholic nor Apostolic. This seems manifest."

The points of difference naturally fall into two classes; those of doctrine and those of polity.

I. With regard to doctrine, it is well known to many, but not to all of our contemporary brethren in the various denominations of Christians, that within well-defined and widely separated bounds, all varieties of Christian doctrine *not inconsistent with the Nicene Faith* may be held and may be preached among us without fear or favor. The Divine guidance vouchsafed to the Anglican Church is conspicuous in her wonderful abstinence from minute definitions, her breadth of view, her wise tolerance, her amazing silence where in other quarters there have been many diverse and clamoring voices, her reverence for truth made manifest by wariness not to be wise above that which is written. Sectarianism, whether without or within, bemoans this very quality which in itself distinguishes the Church spirit from the sectarian. There is no Procrustean bed of human devising to which all the utterances of the clergy must be trimmed. There is no Index Expurgatorius other than that which the living Word of God has ordained. There is no narrow rut in which all must run. Onlookers are frequently amazed, and sometimes those within the ample freedom which the Church allows, are grieved and alarmed, as they hear some voice raised in declaration of that with which they individually do not agree. But nevertheless, when one turns to his Prayer Book, which is the present and always "*up-to-date*" standard for what we are to believe and what we are to do, he is ever re-established in that which is the Church's authoritative deliverance, discovers that the true liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free is not trammelled in the least by that wonderful book, and in all troubles and necessities

Brotherhood Convention at Denver thus gave utterance in addressing our separated brethren to what is the thought in all our hearts:

"We know, dear friends, that in the following of the Bible, in the worship of the Church, in the two Holy Sacraments and in the covenanted gift of Confirmation there is further and larger grace if you will but lay hold of it and take it in. We are thankful that you are obedient to the Holy Spirit in many things. We earnestly long that you will press on and obey Him in all things. Meanwhile go on in the right as God gives you to see the right. That far you cannot be wrong. Walking earnestly your present ways before Him, He will open to you His further ways. 'He that is willing to do His will shall know of the doctrine' is our Blessed Lord's own promise."

finds himself comforted and at peace within the venerable defenses of the faith which the Church provides. Here we have, as we believe, the *whole counsel of God*, not a fragment—all the essentials of the faith clear and positive and definite—a pure, evangelic, sacramental, practical Gospel, preached authoritatively and continuously through varied seasons of the Christian year. Here passes royally along the way the Living Christ. The Church shows herself serenely confident in the present, and sure of victory in the future, no matter what may be the maunderings or rantings or half-truth-tellings or perverse misinterpretations, or absurd self-revelations of individual pulpits. Freedom to worship God is combined with freedom to interpret His word, as in no communion beside.

Of course there are dangers in all liberty. Nevertheless ultimately it makes for the whole well-rounded and well-proportioned truth.*

And when one turns to the second class of difficulties, those which have to do with polity, I am not aware that intelligent leaders among the denominations about us make strenuous opposition to the Preface to the Ordinal. Indeed they cannot in the face of history; but only to such interpretation of it as flatly invalidates whatever of commission their various ministers may claim, and this interpretation the Anglican Communion has never authoritatively given,—while for executive and administrative functions there is not wanting on every hand testimony, that the eyes of educated readers of ecclesiastical history as well as of the students of the times in which we live are turning with more and more appreciation toward that form of polity which recognizes constitutional and centralized authority, and provides for an executive.

God's Providence has wrought wonderful changes plainly visible to those who have not lived yet half a century, in the condition of most, if not all, of the Protestant bodies. Much bitterness has disappeared; ecclesiastical controversy is far milder than it used to be; research is now pre-eminently for the *truth*, and not for mere partisan victory.†

* "The Church herself can set forth only the truth and can give her imprimatur to the Catholic faith only, but she can tolerate within her fold persons whose teaching does not fully correspond with the whole faith, in the hope that the abundant grace of God will eventually open their eyes to the truth. To cut them off would be to put them outside the very means which may in the end bring them to a realization of the richness and dignity of their spiritual birthright. But we should remember that 'Precept must be upon precept, line upon line,' and that God is leading souls by different ways and by different degrees of celerity to the full apprehension of the true light. The Church is surely not inconsistent with her charter of salvation if she is a patient mother and clings with tenacious love to all her children and to others as well, teaching them by her sacraments and offices how great is the treasure which she holds in store for them."—*Church paper*.

† For example: I clip this from a prominent Presbyterian paper.

"On the twenty-seventh day of this month, the three hundred and fiftieth

If we believe that truth is mighty and will prevail, may we not well take heart? For we are Anglicans because we believe that in that system lies the truth, and so we need have no anxiety as to the ultimate result.

II. As the maintenance of differences so largely depends upon the one thing, *prejudice*, so, under God, progress will be made toward unity by simply one antidote—*information*; and that, first for our own people, and then for our brethren who are separated from us.

1. The *Church Idea* is absolutely absent from the minds of multitudes of otherwise intelligent Christian people. The whole theory of the Christian revelation is misunderstood on every hand. That our Lord came to this earth to gather together into one communion or flock all the children of God that are scattered abroad is foreign to the popular Protestant Christian thought and consciousness. The individualistic idea of salvation has been made so prominent (and naturally so by reaction in the three centuries of Protestantism) that one can have little hope for rapid progress in the cause of unity until the truth is again brought to the front that the Kingdom of God on earth, definite, organized, imperial, Catholic, is absolutely necessary for the maintenance and defense of the spiritual truths for which the Kingdom stands; absolutely necessary also for the conversion of the world. Our own people in large numbers do not hold this clearly, as witnessed by the apathy with which wide comprehensive plans are considered and the hesitancy with which world-wide movements are undertaken, the disgraceful stinginess of our contributions for missions, the unsympathetic attitude of our people toward the evangelization of the world. The welfare of one's own little parish, the careful preservation of one's own diocesan interests, the paltry and selfish salvation of one's own soul,—these, each one, valuable in its place, are permitted to

anniversary of the tragedy, there will be dedicated on the spot where Servetus was burned, a monument consisting of a simple block of granite, bearing the following (translated) inscriptions: 'Respectful and Grateful Sons of Calvin, Our Great Reformer, But Condemning an Error which was that of his Age, And firmly Attached To Liberty of Conscience And of the Gospel, We have Erected this Expiatory Monument The 27th October, 1903.' 'The 27th October, 1553. Died at the Stake at Champel, Michael Servetus of Villeneuve, Aragon. Born September 29th. 1511.'

"It will be noted that this singular monument is being erected by the friends and followers of Calvin, the Respectful and Grateful Sons' of 'Our Great Reformer,' and not by the friends of Servetus, the victim of the mistaken but wicked deed. The monument on the one hand is not intended to, and does not in any degree, vindicate or sanction the doctrinal views of Servetus; nor, on the other hand, does it pronounce against the views of Calvin; it simply expresses its condemnation of an act of intolerance, and it does this with charity towards Calvin as having committed 'An Error which was that of his Age.' The members of the Reformed Church founded by Calvin, feel that they should repudiate this act of their great founder and set themselves right with the world. They believe it is better to tell the simple truth and renounce any responsibility for and sympathy with the unfortunate act."

overshadow and crowd out from the Christian consciousness the tremendous and significant and stimulating thought of the Holy Catholic Church. The hearts of thousands of our people, as of our separated brethren as well, are out of sympathy (as one can hear on almost any day in conversation) with the infinite tenderness of our Lord's High Priestly prayer, "That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they may be made complete in one." "But the thought that there was once a unity which presented to the world an organism divinely made, and termed by inspiration the Body of Christ, is certain, some time, to be recalled; and afterward will come the search to find it."

Hence, the first great duty that lies at our doors is the education of our own people, by every means in our power, and of others as well, in the great truth of the universal Kingdom or Church of God, visible on earth, that all men may see and thus know that the Father hath sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world. Our Lord started out "to preach the Kingdom of God." His message was called, "The Good Tidings of the Kingdom," and a kingdom is something visible, definite, tangible, organized, with visible officials as well as visible citizens, all enshrining and manifesting principles of life and conduct essential to well-being. And who does not know that the outer part is as essential as the inner? Without the husk the kernel perishes. The Church Idea, against which so many even of our own people are prejudiced, must find abundant emphasis, or we cannot hope for unity.*

2. And with this continual dwelling upon the rightful, visible unity and universality of the Kingdom of God, there must be particular emphasis on the sins of heresy and schism; sins which, to the consciousness of multitudes of Christian people, are extremely indefinite, if not absolutely merely figures of speech; sins, because ascribed in Scripture itself to Satan, the slanderer of the brethren and the hateful antagonist of the well-proportioned, perfect truth; sins, because they sow tares among the wheat; sins, because separating brother from brother, erecting altar against altar, dividing, in order that he, Satan himself, may conquer.

3. Then there must be information and explanation with regard to the divisions that have taken place and that still exist. Our brethren are learning very rapidly that the causes which originally divided were secondary, some of them absolutely trivial. And among the signs of the times which all true Churchmen

* "Who would dream of organizing a commonwealth, an university, an army, or a navy, upon this principle that outward and visible unity need not be considered as particularly important? And if, the higher we rise in the development of social life, the more we feel the need of a perfect order, why should we imagine, that in the structure of the ideal community, the Church, this point may be safely disregarded. If the Church be a Living Body, unity belongs to it of right."—*The Church Idea*, by Dr. Huntington.

hail with gratitude to God are the confederations and alliances, and, in some cases, absolute union of some bodies of Christians, greater or less; all of them, however, of modern origination;—the wide recognition of the evil of strife, keeping Christians apart, dissipating strength, wasting money, causing the loving heart of God to grieve over the imperfections of those who profess and call themselves His children. Knowing so well the underlying love which actuates the whole communion to which we belong, a love which found its meagre expression, as we believe, in the tentative propositions of the Lambeth-Chicago platform, I believe that to bring about, even in one generation, a general movement towards the blessed unity for which our Saviour prayed, it remains only for each bishop in his diocese, and for each clergyman in his parish, to give expression by word and deed to that kindliness in every way that is consistent with convictions of truth and duty and loyalty. There need never be surrender of principle. There need never be exasperating recrimination. There need be no yielding of conviction. There need never be disloyalty to the Holy Church whose principles and doctrines we hold. There must be always recognition of the immense danger of gaining outward union and temporary advantage at the expense of domestic peace and further and ultimate advantage. There must be unwearied patience, ceaseless prayer, and loving trust in God and His promises; and there must always be recognition of the Nicene Faith of the undivided Church, which is our anchor in the shifting tides of the centuries. But one need never fear that the cause will be betrayed by those who, held by that anchor, meet the waves, not to buffet them, but to ride them; the historic Church affording a refuge for all, whether of ourselves or others, who are more or less shipwrecked, certainly “all at sea,” whether on rafts or in boats or on broken pieces of their fragile ships. And so it shall come to pass, that all shall escape safe to land.

4. Another department of information should be opened. As a recent writer puts it, “It surely is time, and it would be helpful, to remind our friends of other Christian bodies of what they owe to the communion which, in this as in the mother land, they often treat with such scant courtesy. They should remember that it was the Church of England which, able to trace her descent to the times when the modern theory of the Papacy, arrogating to itself the over-lordship of Christendom, was unknown, reasserted the ancient right of national Churches to govern themselves, and gave to English-speaking Christians a Prayer Book and a Bible in the common tongue. Not a new Church, but the Church of her fathers reformed, she kept her children in spiritual touch with the Christianity of the first centuries and prepared to remit to posterity the blessings of the liberty wherewith Christ had made men free. And to do all this she suffered long and sorely, ‘resisting unto blood’ the attempts of her enemies to re-

entangle her in the olden 'yoke of bondage.' It was not Presbyterians and Congregationalists, it was not Baptists and Methodists, who died in defense of Christian rights at Oxford and Smithfield, for Presbyterians and Congregationalists, Baptists and Methodists, as organized bodies, were then unknown; it was English Churchmen who so suffered; and it was not until the battle with Rome had been practically won that the earliest of the denominations to which reference has been made came into existence." *

5. Still another truth,—a commonplace to us, but often lost sight of by Protestantism,—is the underlying basis of the one Baptism. It is news to great numbers of otherwise fairly intelligent Christian people that no one can possibly be baptized into the Methodist communion, or the Baptist or the Presbyterian or the Protestant Episcopal, but only and always into the one Church of Christ, primitive, apostolic, universal. Hence unity is to be had, not by leaving one Church for another, but by all alike recognizing their membership in the one Church of Christ, and learning to make use of all the privileges which belong of right to every member of that Church—its ministry, its ordinances, its promise of perpetuity until the end of the world.

Privilege, standing, authority, continuity, permanence—these all await the separated children of the Reformation,—their own property,—of which they are ignorant, and, because ignorant, careless and indifferent. To tell them of all this is no arrogant task of ours, but a fraternal and Christ-like duty, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear. The bishops, as they make their visitations and have opportunity to address multitudes of our denominational brethren, might well urge these unfamiliar, but intensely practical thoughts upon the attention of the usually crowded congregations. They are seed thoughts, and must by God's blessing surely bring forth fruit.

6. In the meantime, as urged by one of our Church papers, "Churchmen ought to be employed carefully in rigid self-examination that we may root out from our own body, which is a part of the Kingdom of God, everything that pertains to sectarianism. We must prepare ourselves for the future unity that awaits the larger extension of the desire for it among all Christian people. American Churchmen are not themselves possessed of the temper which will lead towards unity. It must be the primary duty of all Churchmen to foster the spirit which will tend thereto." †

* From *The Northeast*.

† "At least the Church must recognize that the one broad, cohesive programme for the Church's future is that promulgated by Catholic-minded men. It, and it alone, embraces the entire foreign and domestic relations of the Church. It alone contemplates reform of ourselves as the first preliminary toward future reunion. Other schemes have been eloquent in urging other people to reform. This turns the search-light within and tries first to point out and then to eradicate what, *on our part*, stands in the way of Christian Unity. Unity, without surrender of historic truth, is our goal. The question

One generation is not much in the life of a Church. We must be satisfied if, in our lives, we accomplish just a little in the direction of that which all Christian disciples most fervently desire.

If this Conference cares to make any pronouncement upon this subject, I would venture to suggest, with deference, six points, as follows:

POINTS SUGGESTED FOR RESOLUTIONS.

1. A declaration that, notwithstanding differences, we believe the underlying basic baptismal unity, which cannot be denied, gives promise of (aye, makes inevitable) the fulfillment of our Lord's High Priestly Prayer, and calls for diligent effort on the part of all Christian people.

2. That we of the Anglican Communion pledge ourselves anew to constant thought and prayer and conscientious effort towards unity, and earnestly call our separated brethren to the same, and to the mutual study of the things which make for peace.

3. That, believing our position to be much misunderstood and misrepresented, we urge upon our people more widespread and popular use of newspapers, tracts, and similar literature to dispel ignorance and remove prejudice, as far as possible, among all Christian people.

4. That we remind our separated brethren that the Anglican position as to doctrine remains absolutely unchanged since the denominations were organized, and because the spirit and temper of all earnest-minded Christian people have been so modified by God's grace, we believe that there is good reason to hope that progress may now be made towards unity of feeling and of work.

5. That points of agreement with the larger bodies being numerous and fundamental, while disagreements are fewer and avowedly in a considerable degree secondary, we are ready to discuss these latter points in a spirit of charity wherever a like spirit is manifested by any of our denominational brethren.

6. That, inasmuch as the faith and the polity which we represent have withstood the vicissitudes of well-nigh nineteen centuries, while the divisions we deplore are of modern origin, and the various organizations already manifestly giving token of rapid changes if not of disintegration, there is reason to think that

before Churchmen is not when they will attain it, but when they will *begin to try*. It is a scheme that may ultimately cover centuries, and we are not discouraged that even the first steps are taken slowly. Other reforms in the Church have been obliged, similarly, to await their 'fullness of time.' A 'Morning Star' had to precede by two centuries the sixteenth-century Reformation. In our own day, the Divorce Reform movement has had to undergo the same delay. First an academic question, then acceptance by our Bishops, then by our lower Clergy, then by our laity, then will result practical realization."

return to well-tried and, as we believe, primitive principles will, ere long, result in primitive unity. Thus, as there is and always has been but one body and one spirit, one hope of our calling, one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, all Christian people may be brought to be all of one heart and one soul, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

THURSDAY MORNING.

Fifth Topic.

THE ATTITUDE OF OUR CHURCH TOWARD THE PROTESTANT COMMUNIONS AROUND HER.

(b) POINTS OF DIFFERENCE AND THEIR EMPHASIS.

Second Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. JOHN PHILIP DU MOULIN, D.C.L.,
BISHOP OF NIAGARA.

It is my duty to follow my Right Reverend brother and to deal with points of difference and their explanation.

In attempting this I will try to look at some points of difference from the Canadian standpoint.

1. I am sorry to think and to say that there does not appear to be any very cordial desire on the part of our separated brethren for reunion. This I submit is a just inference to be drawn from the history of this movement to the present time.

The Church has recognized the duty of the parent to seek her lost children. For nearly fifty years the matter of reunion has been kept alive in the Northern and Southern Convocations of the Church of England. The Church in Australia and in Canada, in 1886, petitioned the then coming Lambeth Conference to deal with the matter. But the most decided and practical action was taken by the American Church in the General Convention of 1886 on the petition of more than a thousand clergy, including thirty-two bishops. The Convention, having considered the matter, formulated four articles as a basis of negotiations for reunion, and desired that it should be made known to our separated brethren that the Church was ready to meet them in brotherly conference with a view to approaching some settlement of our unhappy divisions. The same business was dealt with in the Pan-Anglican Council held in 1888. This most representative body of our communion, including bishops of the Holy Catholic Church, assembled from divers parts of the earth at Lambeth and discussed the whole matter with patience and charity. A Committee was appointed, and it duly reported, reciting the steps

that had been taken in this direction, setting out the four articles put forth by the American Church, now known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral, recommending that all this be made known to the bodies outside, that information be circulated as to our position, that prayers be offered, that every right step be taken toward honorable reunion.

Nearly twenty years have elapsed since the action of the General Convention of 1886, followed by the Lambeth Report and Resolutions of 1888. The action of the Pan-Anglican Conference was the nearest approach in modern days to the pronouncement of a general council. It was as far as possible authoritative. It was definite, reasonable, and was intended to be an overture of peace, brotherly love, and desire for union to all the bodies outside. Such proposals most surely deserved the respectful and careful consideration of all concerned. So far as I have been able to ascertain, no formal acknowledgment or answer, as wide and authoritative as the overture, has ever been put forth by those addressed.

The frantic appeals of Canon Henson from the pulpit of the venerable Abbey and in the public press, and the presence and amenities of Canon Fleming at the installation of the new pastor at the City Temple, have evoked no general response. This is not surprising, for it could hardly be expected that the suggestions and advances of the Pan-Anglican Conference being disregarded, the voices of private individuals would produce better results.

Our experience in Canada has been similar. Our synods have taken up the subject of unity and have from time to time appointed committees to meet representatives from the other bodies. Meetings have been held in Toronto and elsewhere; papers have been read from side to side; courtesies have been exchanged, but no substantial results have followed. The initiative in such proceedings has been uniformly taken by the Church, and the response has been in effect, "We come to meet you because you desire it rather than because we have any hope of success."

Indeed, large numbers of our separated brethren are quite satisfied with the present position of things. They consider that the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace is all-sufficient; they desire nothing more. Others are content with the platform of the Evangelical Alliance, "Let us agree to differ." There is also a very wide expression of this sentiment, "So long as the Church holds herself aloof from our platforms and projects, and refuses an interchange of pulpit ministrations, it is useless to discuss the subject of reunion." So far as one can observe and judge from actions, there is not much desire on the part of Protestant bodies outside for entrance into the Church. They are altogether self-satisfied. They do not acknowledge that we have anything of importance to give them which they do not possess themselves.

They are strong in self-confidence and not infrequently in self-glorification.

2. It is important to observe that this unresponsive position of the denominations is strengthened by their success. In Canada the Methodists stand first of the Protestant bodies, numbering 916,886, the Presbyterians second, numbering 842,442, the Church third, numbering 680,620. Their properties and possessions are in like proportion. The Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, and others have costly churches, colleges, parsonages, and properties all over the Dominion. In the cities they pay larger stipends to their ministers than those paid by the Church. They are lavish in expenditure on organs, choirs, and services. Their church newspapers are well conducted and enter the homes of all their people. The "Methodist Book Room," as it is called, is one of the largest, best conducted, and most profitable publishing concerns in the country. But a far more important matter is this that they gather in from their people and lay out on their missions work in the home and foreign fields, a great deal more than is contributed or expended by the Church for the same objects. The Presbyterian body for the coming year have called for \$300,000 for their mission work, the Methodists for \$250,000, while the Church is struggling to realize \$75,000 for her missions, home and foreign.

Is it therefore a matter of wonder that the Protestant communions outside the Church are inflated with success, contented with their position, desiring nothing beyond their ever-increasing growth, and condescending and patronizing rather than deferring at all to the Church? The Methodists have practically renounced the name "Wesleyan" and call themselves the Great Methodist Church. The Presbyterians are, The Presbyterian Church of Canada.

As further evidence that there does not exist on the part of the bodies without any strong and general desire for corporate unity, we may observe that such large Christian bodies as the Presbyterians and Methodists, who hold in common the same form of ministry and methods of worship and order, do not incline to blend together and unite for the saving of money, labor, and strength, and for the glory of God.

If they be thus slow to unite with each other, preferring to remain apart, the hope is not greatly encouraged that they should be quick to unite with us. It should also be noticed that the *raison d'être* of some of the outside bodies, such as the Baptist body, being contrary to our fundamental principles, would absolutely stand in the way of reunion.

In England the matters just referred to stand reversed. The Church is established and richly endowed. Lordly titles and estates are hers. The magnificent cathedrals, abbeys, the ancient universities and churches of the land are her heritages. The bishops are lords spiritual. The Primate in order of state follows

the royal family. The Book of Common Prayer is enrolled among the archives of the Constitution. The prestige of the Established Church is unquestionable. All this is viewed by the nonconformists with feelings of resentment and envy easily understood. They are ever ready to join with all revolutionists who cry, "Down with the Establishment." The attitude of the principal nonconforming bodies is largely political and historical. The alliteration "popery and prelacy" tells of fierce struggles between the state and nonconformists, recalling the phrase of King James, "No bishop, no king."

The Independents, Anabaptists, Quakers and others have fought and been fought in civil as well as religious encounter. The popular Presbyterian mind decides the question of a liturgy not so much by an appeal to Biblical or Patristic lore as by the recollection of Jeanie Geddes and her stool. The recent Education Bill has made wide the cleavage between the Church and dissent.

Some of our brethren in England of extremist type have adopted almost everything Romish—vestments, ceremonies, terminology, calling the Holy Communion the Mass, celebrating it with ritual as like Rome as possible, and, as in a conspicuous case recently, this ended by an Anglican priest, his curates, part of his congregation, and Sunday-school, all marching from their parish church into the nearest Roman Catholic establishment and there submitting themselves to the Roman obedience.

Such misfortunes do not make for unity. The Church of England has been sorely wounded in the house of her friends, and the power which her peculiar position of moderation ought to give her in the business of mediation and reconciliation has been disastrously minimized and weakened.

The nonconformists of to-day resist with all their force the attendance of their children at schools where the Church holds influence, and have banded themselves together in a system of passive resistance to the recent Education Act, which means nothing else than rebellious breaches of the law of the land.

In the United States and in British North America, our ecclesiastical nomenclature has given us a deal of trouble. We call ourselves "The Church of England in Canada," and we get the full benefit of the name. The outside bodies identify us with our great mother. By this all her glories and all her mistakes should become in a measure ours. But as poor human nature is ever more quick to remember the mistakes than the glories, so we sometimes come in for more blame than praise by our connection with the Church of England.

There is some ground for the way in which we are regarded in Canada as an offshoot from the State Church. We began as a State Church in some degree. Royal grants in land were made to the Church in British North America. "Crown rectories" were established and endowed. They still exist. Our bishops

and their successors were named "lord bishops" in letters patent from the crown. In the table of precedence now in use at the seat of government, archbishops go before bishops, and bishops, coming next, take precedence of other ministers of religion. All these matters smack very strongly of a State Church.

Such things may be very small, but the minds of people are just as small. The leading Presbyterian minister in the city of Ottawa, after the recent visit of the Prince of Wales, devoted his Sunday-morning sermon to an attack on the court regulations whereby the bishops are appointed to go before the ministers in a procession at Government House from the drawing room to the dining hall. We have lately been visited by three emissaries from England—a Presbyterian minister, the successor of the late Dr. Parker at the City Temple, and a Methodist minister of note. These men expounded to the Canadian people the Education Act as passed in England, and inflamed their minds against the Church in a matter with which on this side we have nothing to do.

Such occurrences are hindrances, and calculated to thwart in a large measure the Church's efforts to bring about godly union and concord.

3. A further and a formidable hindrance presents itself in the constant projection of new and outlandish sects or movements, depending at their outset and for their future on the personality of their founders.

Such is the Christian Science movement, its head and founder a woman, her ideas as reflected in her book hazy, confused, unintelligible. Its whole basis is a contradiction to living life and reality. Its growth and its wealth are enormous. In thirty years this body, opposed as it is to fact, experience, and even common sense, has, notwithstanding, attained a prodigious growth.

How almost impossible any attempt to persuade such a leader and such followers that their schism is an evil to be abandoned and undone. The head and founder of Christian Science is deified by her more than enthusiastic disciples. If the Goddess of Reason is identified with a bloody and turbulent period of human history, is the Goddess of Unreason likely to be less troublesome? Who could persuade an idolized and vain woman? Who could convince her wild worshippers?

Whatever be the extravagances of Christian Science, they are greatly exceeded by those of Dowie and Dowieism, the most audacious impostor of modern days. Founded and conducted by a pseudo-prophet, Elijah the Restorer, episcopally robed, the head of a city and of a large following, with a keen eye to business, the receiver of large revenues, the leader and commander of a strange army, is engaged, while we are meeting here, in storming New York City.

To persuade such a man and such multitudes to haul down their flag and confess themselves invaders of the Church's unity,

troublers of Zion and divisionists would be about the most seemingly hopeless undertaking.

A more gracious part of one's duty would be, in closing this enumeration of differences, to offer some explanations of positions so antagonistic to union.

But it is not easy to explain such matters as we have referred to in a way so satisfactory as to remove them from the path of great hindrances to our Divine Master's idea and prayer for oneness in body, spirit, and action.

And yet we would fain cling to the hope that His Divine prayer, followed by the less perfect intercessions of His Holy Church, will one day have an answer; that His forces will yet be so consolidated that the world may believe in His divine mission. This most certainly we should look for and expect. That for it we must learn to labor and to wait there can be little doubt. The pendulum of public feeling in such matters swings from side to side. A century ago the English-speaking people habitually indulged in swearing. Dueling was an honorable act. Gross and brutal drunkenness was a part of gentlemanly hospitality. At the beginning of the last century the Church was little conscious of her missionary responsibility and consequently inactive in the field of the world. To predict an utter revolution in these matters would have been regarded as an enthusiast's dream. But the revolution has taken place. The Spirit of God has moved men's hearts, and before his fiery breath the dead stand on their feet an exceedingly great army. Why should it not be so in this matter? Nothing surely can be plainer than the evil and unprofitableness, the impediments, the waste, the evil spirit, the uncharitableness of our unhappy divisions. Why should it be thought incredible that the followers of the one Christ everywhere should some day all awaken to a sense of this and strive to heal the wounds of His body? There is ground, abundant ground for faith and hope in the irresistible, all-subduing power of the Holy Ghost over human hearts. Already we see the coming together of various kinds of Presbyterians in one body and the different sorts of Methodists in one Methodist communion. These are steps in the right direction. The agglomeration of these bodies around the Church would be a powerful appeal to the rest of divided Christendom to come together likewise, and so the movement, once begun, would proceed rapidly. This has been God's method in the past—why not in the future?

Be it ours to hope that among the wide ranks of the sundered and self-satisfied there be many true souls yearning for the end of dissensions, and for one body, one spirit, and one hope of our calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism.

Be it ours to avoid all occasions of misunderstanding. To be courteous, charitable, considerate, broad-minded toward our separated brethren; to work with them as far as possible; always to

leave the impression that, instead of disparaging, we love them and long for a full corporate reunion of the Body of Christ.

Be it ours to pray constantly that all may come to see the great danger we are in by our unhappy divisions, that henceforth we may all be of one heart and of one soul, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, and may, with one mind and one mouth, glorify the one God.

And while we do all this the vision will come to us clearer, ever clearer, of the one army of the Living God, with ranks closed up, marching to the conquest of the world, and the while enjoying to the full the goodness and the pleasantness of dwelling together in unity.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON.

Sixth Topic.

METHODS OF THE CHURCH'S WORK IN EVANGELIZING THE SPECIALLY DEPENDENT RACES IN AMERICA.

(a) THE NEGRO RACE.

First Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. ALFRED MAGILL RANDOLPH, D.D., LL.D.,
BISHOP OF SOUTHERN VIRGINIA.

Christianity, in its relations to the problems of the education and the regeneration of the Negro race, occupies a position identical with its attitude toward all other branches of the family of mankind. The question of the conversion of the Negro race, not only here, but in its original home, with its hundreds of millions of population, is identical both in relation to duty and to possibility.

Of the Indian, the Hindoo, the African, and the Mongolian, we ask, Is he a man? Has he a conscience? Has he a spiritual nature? Has he an instinctive belief that he will live after death? that he will exist in another world in his personal identity and consciousness, just as he has continued to exist beyond yesterday into to-day, and every day of his life? If he has these characteristics which define and identify human nature underneath all of its physiological and ethnological variations, then there is not only an adaptation, but a need and a hope and a necessity which the revelation of God in Christ alone can satisfy.

In our generation, even among scientific skeptics and philosophers of the materialistic school, we have passed beyond the crude speculations and unscientific conjectures of the middle of the last century, proposing the theory of the diversity of origin as the explanation of the variations in the types of mankind. In

the realm of mind, of ethics, and of spirit, experience in the education of the lowest forms of human intelligence, the recognition of conscience, undeveloped and distorted, but still existing in the deepest degradations of humanity, and the universality of the beliefs of natural religion, all point to the unity of mankind. While the theory of variation of origin has only external divergences for its support, it has internal and physiological unity and identity for its refutation. As far as we can generalize from the testimony of history, there is a persistent tendency and instinct in these divergences to perpetuate themselves and to preserve racial autonomy and integrity; and the higher the race the wider its providential destiny and work, the stronger the development of this instinct. Each race doubtless has its mission to fulfill in the growth of civilization and in the progress of the regenerating power of Christianity; and the philosophy of history warrants the induction that, as each individual has his place of influence and duty to fill in the great brotherhood of the Christian Church, as each branch of the Church has its contribution to render and its stone to carve for the great temple of the Kingdom of God in the world, so each race has its divine lesson to teach and the results of its experience to impart to the ever-growing fabric of human civilization.

If that is true, we have the solution of that unwritten law for the preservation of the races in their integrity, found in the highest development in the white race, the leading, guiding, and governing race of mankind, but found in them all. The lower races have, as we might expect to find, less of race dignity, and less sense of degradation in yielding to animal passions transcending racial bounds, from an aspiration to rise in contact with a superior race; yet among the lower, where the conscience has been enlightened and quickened by the redeeming grace of the Gospel, the commingling of races in any form becomes identified with the degradation of both, and race diversity itself becomes the occasion of the development of the consciousness of spiritual unity, in which the lower is lifted by the hand of the higher to a sense of its dignity as members of Christ, as children of God, as inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven.

Sir Henry M. Stanley, the great modern traveler and perhaps the widest observer of the races of mankind, closes his testimony in these words: "In all my travels I have seen nothing more wonderful than this, that in whatever disguise I have found man, something in him seems to justify the belief that we are all the children of one Father." His impression, developing into a profound conviction from long-continued and varied observation and experience, was that man, from the lowest to the highest, is a child of God, having in him conscience and a spirit separating him by an infinite gulf from the animal world. The Bible prophecies were made thousands of years ago upon the same impression, the same profound conviction. The prophet looked

out upon the world with its diverse races as we do to-day. He saw underneath all their variations that they were men, as he was a man. They had a reason, a conscience, a spiritual nature, a heart as he had, and upon these facts he predicted that the worship of one God would supersede the worship of all false gods. He saw the prophecy in the mind of man, in the type of religion for which he was made, and which, however overlaid, would in the final event assert itself. The world was against him, and he a representative of one little nation. But he saw to the bottom and grasped the ultimate principle. Polytheism in the light of that principle must be only a temporary phase of illusion. The venerable creeds, the deep philosophies, were empty and artificial and untrue to human nature, to its wants, its need, its cry, its foundation convictions. Upon that basis, with absolute certainty, he predicted the death of Polytheism and the universal worship of and prevalence of the idea of one God. We have their prophecies, and by the side of those prophecies we have the fulfillment which has progressively verified, and will continue to verify, the principle upon which they were made thousands of years ago.

If man has a conscience, a reason, a heart, the redemption of Christianity for time and for eternity is for him. There are obstacles to Christianity, and have been from the day of Christ's Ascension, when He issued His parting command: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature"—"Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Obstacles are presented by different civilizations and special characteristics of races and nations; but Christianity has not listened to any argument to prove that any race or nation is impervious to the appeal and congenitally blind to the light of the Gospel. More than a hundred years ago, the most brilliant writer of his generation in England, in an article in the *Edinburgh Review*, written to prove the folly of the efforts and expenditure for the conversion of the natives of India and to urge its abandonment, has these words: "If a Hindoo is irreligious, or, in other words, if he loses his caste, he is deserted by father, mother, by wife and child, and kindred and friends, and becomes instantly a solitary wanderer upon the earth. We do not say it is difficult to convert the Chinese or the Japanese, but the Hindoos. We are not saying it is difficult to convert human creatures, but difficult to convert human creatures with such institutions." He regarded the institution of caste as an impregnable bulwark of the powers of evil against the advance of Christianity. It was the backbone of the social, the political, and the religious life of the race. If Sydney Smith had lived in this generation, he would have recognized in the vast Empire of India that things which are impossible with man alone are not only possible, but inevitable with God and man united; human nature and God in contact in the revelation and the power of the Gospel.

Since his day the monster institution of caste has been slowly receding and disintegrating at the foundations, in the new atmosphere and light of Christianity. Caste is undoubtedly the most powerful barrier ever encountered by Christian civilization, because it is more compact in an organization permeating every occupation, every profession, and every institution of life; but still it has been powerless, and will be powerless, to intimidate the inroads and the assimilating forces of Christianity.

The disposition and the race characteristics of the Japanese present obstacles to Christianity depressing to the missionary. The Japanese is brilliant, but fickle. He is the specimen in the modern pagan world of the religious skeptic. He is like the Greek, ever ready for the new and equally ready to let go the old. He is inconstant, unsteady. But underneath he has the same human nature, facing the same tremendous problems which Christianity alone can solve, and was meant to solve. The Galatians were fickle, but the love and the wonder of the Gospel steadied and anchored them. And so the Greek, with his sensual emotionalism and his æsthetic intellectualism and his gay worldliness, was lifted by the Gospel to lay hold upon truth that imparted character, that educated him out of his instability, and appropriated his intellectual agility and culture and his wonderful language to be its vehicle for transmission to the world.

The experience of the Christian Church has verified the faith underlying all missionary effort, that with a fair and solid contact with the principles and the needs of human nature, Christianity is bound to demolish paganism in all of its forms and to transcend all obstacles presented in the variations of condition and character among the races of mankind.

In speaking of obstacles presenting trials to faith in the work of our own Church and of other organized Christian bodies, larger and superior in missionary resources to our own, among the Negro population of the country, of the South and the North, there are some the mention of which might alienate the sympathies of those whose opinions have been formed upon abstract principles, and who have been without the opportunity of testing them by observation and experience. Ethnology and race conditions are purely scientific studies, and the study of all sciences is a process of induction from the observation of facts. The need of the Negro, as a foundation upon which to build education, the character for citizenship and stability in religion, which conditions everything else, is family life, family law, family religion, family fidelity. The family is, in the ultimate analysis, the unit of society. The family trust, the family authority, the family religion, these are the beginnings, the springs, the unseen foundations. There is no trust that human beings put in one another like the trust between husband and wife, between parent and child. From the family this trust goes forth to the aggregation of families and forms the atmosphere of the moral life of

the community. It enters into all the relations and interchanges of life, imparting social stability and coherence. Without trust in the family you will have it nowhere else. Your business rests upon trust; your politics rest upon trust. A distinguished English philosopher, writing upon social and national life, says of the family: "The blessing and the curse of it penetrate every corner of the most artificial society. Look at the *Marriage à la mode* of Hogarth. Meditate on the ghastly breakfast table which is the preparation for all the tragedy that follows. The great painter of English social morality tells you there of the history of commercial failures, of political distrust, of sensual wreck, of domestic degradation." The idea he embodies in the great picture is that they all go back to the desecration of the conjugal relation; for that is a relation, and a relation is not a human arrangement, a device which man has adopted, and which he may change or adjust; but it is constitutional, it is indigenous, it is in the roots of things, a condition of the life of the organism, whether it is physical or spiritual. Such is the family. Its recognition as such is the criterion of the efficiency and the achievements of any people. Its loss or its dishonor is the beginning of the death of races and nations on their way to animalism and to extinction.

We have ten millions of the African race in our midst. From the dawn of history they have been under the bondage of slavery, whether in their native homes or scattered over the earth. Here they are gathered with no choice or agency of ours, or their own. The great problem is not to be solved by peripatetic speakers and lecturers about education. Whatever our liberal people, our countrymen of the northern and western portions of our land may say and do, the burden and the pressure and the solicitude are upon the South. The Southern people want their help, and God knows they need it. If, perchance, our people of the North and West should speak and act and inflame their minds with the problem upon the plane of ignorance or passion or political rivalry, the part of the people of the South is to be patient and to go on doing their duty without fear in the sight of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, who died for these people, as for all the children of men. All of our fellow-countrymen will know the problem one of these days; perhaps in the near future. For this race are migratory children, and they will make this whole land their home; and then this great branch of the Anglo-Saxon Christian world will become one in the knowledge of the problem and one in sympathy in the great work of redeeming and educating this people to be in the long future the civilizers and the evangelists of their own native land, shadowed for ages in the darkness of heathenism.

More than any other, this race in our midst needs an awakening of conscience, a quickening of long ages of slumber and of deadness in family life, family dignity, and family fidelity. There are, it is

true, thousands of them who have imbibed the Christian idea of the family from the home of the master and mistress under the old pupilage of slavery, and who have learned the profound import of purity in family life since their emancipation from legal bondage. But what are these thousands to the millions who are without fathers and mothers, without sons and daughters, without trust and love in the home, as God meant it to be! Writers among the educated Negroes, with one noble exception, have obscured this condition, or rather have allowed hysterical yearnings for what is called "manhood" to blind them to the reality; while the magazine writer and the politician of the white race have, for the most part, handled the whole question in the atmosphere of sentiment divorced from reason, and theory without foundation upon the observation of facts. The impulse to save must know the perils of the objects of its solicitude and compassion, otherwise it spends itself in vain.

Another obstacle in the religious and moral development of the Negro is his contact with politics under a system of government which of all others, though the simplest and the purest, is the most complicated in its demands upon the intelligence and morality of the individual, and the most open to abuse and corruption when that intelligence and morality are in a rudimentary state of development.

Our relations to these ten millions of an alien race have no guiding precedent in history. They present new problems which cannot be disposed of by repeating over and over again some political shibboleth, like "liberty, equality, and fraternity." Plato's republic was a sublime ideal, but a grotesque impossibility in a world like this. The English people in India are a handful compared to the millions of the natives. When England went to India the tribes were engaged in wars of extermination, and the Hindoo was gravitating toward extinction. England's law, her courts of justice, her benign reasonableness and her firm hand have saved a great people perhaps for a great future on the continent of Asia. England governs and the Hindoo, though perhaps the most intelligent of the nations of the East, knows that it is best for him that she should govern. He feels his incapacity. He wants a longer time to learn. Darwin, in his "Descent of Man," says that the "death of races is often caused by the attempts to civilize them." They absorb the vices of civilization, but decline its burdens. They are impulsive, tentative, impatient of steady aim and purpose for future achievement. The Negro does not shrink from physical toil, and in this respect he is nearer to the type of progressive civilization than the Indian, who prefers hunting to plowing, and in refusing to obey the law, "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread," he refuses civilization and gravitates to beggary and want and extinction. The Negro bears physical burdens with cheerfulness, and his toil has made many a wilderness all over our land to blossom as the

rose. But physical toil is perhaps the least of the burdens of civilization. It is always cheerful. It has in it an element of pleasure, which Divine Providence has attached to it as one of the laws of its activity. "The husbandman holdeth the plow and giveth his mind to the furrows. The carpenter laboreth night and day, and is diligent to make great variety. The smith sitteth at the anvil and considereth the iron work, and his eyes look still upon the pattern of the thing that he maketh, and he setteth his mind to finish it and to polish it perfectly." The body workers need no commiseration from the brain workers of the world. But still the Negro is an illustration of Darwin's law of the decay of the weaker races in the attempt to civilize them prematurely.

Take the suffrage, the most responsible gift of the highest civilization. The Negro looks forward to it as the advent of his temporal salvation. What does he do with it. How does he learn to regard it? In time he learns to sell it for a few cents, or for a dollar, or for perhaps more. I do not refer to the best specimens of religion and education, who are few compared to the great masses. These last have their consciences progressively degraded and educated downward by this gift of civilization.

The Roman Church carries some elements of Christianity that exercise saving influences upon human nature; but the difficulty is that it contains practices that corrupt the weak and the ignorant, and they are the many. It educates the conscience downward. It holds up the Cross to sinners, and sin that must be saved only by the Cross of the Son of God must be a tremendous reality. But yet in practice it makes little of sin, by assigning little tasks, as bead-counting and Pater Nosters, for its remission. The weaker souls among its votaries are learning the logic of estimating the weight of sin by the price paid for it in little penances and not in the great redemption. So, in the mind where ethics is divorced from political duty and conscience is for sale, you recognize the germ of fatal corruption in popular government.

You may reply that the Negro's conscience has been depraved instead of educated by the exercise of suffrage, by reason of the example and agency of the white man. But that only confirms Mr. Darwin's theory of the tendency of the weak to assimilate only the vices, in contact with a civilization that is above them. There exists in the highest civilizations of the Christian nations an element that represents the disintegrating forces of vice; but there exists also a public sentiment that hedges vice around and circulates through the channels of government to carry off the waste and eliminate the poison. But in the weak race there is no public sentiment, but only widespread ignorance and a dead or dying conscience. I think it may be said that, in the opinion of the wisest educators of the Negroes, belonging themselves to the race, that the restriction in the Southern States in the exercise

of the right of suffrage by educational and property qualifications has removed obstacles to their spiritual, moral, and intellectual development. Indiscriminate suffrage has separated the Negro from his best friends and planted suspicion in his mind toward the whites of the North and the South, besides depraving his own conscience and the political conscience of the whole country. I am sure its restriction has helped to remove obstacles to his conversion to Christianity in the Church of which we are the representatives.

In relation to the secular education of the Negro race, it is enough for me to say that the generous and systematic contributions from the Northern States to our Church schools and the millions collected by the tax-gatherer from the whites of the Southern States are evidences of a conscience awakened to the duty of the enlightenment of the Negro up to the measure of his ability and the interests of his temporal and his spiritual welfare. With reference to the public schools for the Negroes, the question of the exclusion of religion from public instruction is one of far greater consequences than in the case of the white schools. Those who are opposed to religious teaching in the public schools, and, indeed, all sensible people who are not infidels, agree that school instruction would be better with the elements of religious instruction than without it. But those who oppose the introduction of religion into public instruction do so upon the ground that government is not the proper agent for the dissemination of religion. The Government is the political representative of many creeds, many Churches, many variations of religious belief. It represents a divided nation, so far as religion is concerned, and therefore it must be neutral. It could not adopt the Creed of any one without the alienation of all the rest. And that seems to be plausible to the popular mind, though the Bible and the foundation principles of Christian morality and the great Creeds of Christendom belong to all forms of Christianity. But, accepting the fact as it stands, it amounts practically to the exclusion of the Negro child from all religious instruction. He has no religious home, and for the great masses he is without a Church. Therefore, if he is to learn at all, he is dependent upon parish schools. The rational policy, then, of all missionary work of the Church among Negroes is the recognition of the parish school as the fundamental agency and necessity. And, again, it is worthy of effort, with conference with Protestant bodies around us, to bring to bear influences upon the governments of States to open schools with such forms of religious service as harmony among all Christians may devise. Childhood never forgets creeds and prayers. With the vast masses of Negro children it is their only chance to learn. What a pity for a Christian people to suffer little pagans to pass all the educational opportunities of childhood without the Bible, the hymns, the blessed old Creeds.

Referring to our discussion of the family as the first and therefore the highest school for the education of childhood in obedience, and in the elements of morality, we are reminded of the material conditions which obtain in the great masses of the Negro population. Their homes and home training are in the country. The young men and women in large numbers gravitate to the cities in search of employment; but families are reared in the country. A cabin with two or three, but most frequently with only one room, is the home of the Negro. Men and women, boys and girls, live for the the most part in these narrow conditions. The factory laws in a majority of the States prohibit the employment of children under twelve years in the cotton factories. It was only after a long struggle in England, a hundred years ago, that Peel and his party convinced Parliament and the English nation that they could not rely upon fathers and mothers to protect their own children from the disease and blight of factory work. The cupidity of parents forced the little children into the poisonous air and grinding toil of the factories; and the English race, in the factory districts, as years passed, began to manifest alarming signs of physical degeneracy. The laws intervened to save the children. Would legislation be possible or practicable to save the children of our poor, ignorant Negro race from corruption and moral degeneracy, in the springs of their life, in being reared in such conditions in the homes referred to? The question is too wide for the limits of this paper, and perhaps I have already transcended the time allotted.

There are some who believe such legislation to be practicable, and, if so, there are those who will not rest until they bring public opinion, crystallized into law, to bear upon the moral regeneration of the Negro race. But short of law, Christianity and the Church, the most powerful agencies for awakening and educating the conscience, may accomplish a regeneration of morals and of character, in the foundation relations of life, among a race, kind and impressible and capable of the noblest fidelity; capable also of being touched and lifted, as all of God's children, by the love of Christ and human effort and sacrifice for the wandering and the lost.

We have seen that the spirit and faith of prophecy are identical with the missionary spirit and faith of Christianity. They believe in final results from causes requiring time to work, and therefore certain and inevitable in accomplishment. They believe in God's purpose and in human nature responding to that purpose, and for its accomplishment they believe in time; they have faith in time. Time, with some, is only a philosophical abstraction, and the belief in it has no quality or power of living faith. There are many minds that have no real belief in time. They believe in the present; they believe in to-day; they are in a hurry about all enterprises. If results are not immediate they abandon the foundation they have

laid. They have no belief in seed-planting which requires a far-off harvest. The difference between a mere politician and a statesman is that one works for and believes in immediate results to be accomplished in the present exigency and justifies a compromise of principle to achieve that result. The statesman believes in principles and is patient and confident of their final victory. So Christianity believes in time. Christian faith and Christian imagination see in time great spaces, stretches of years, ages, wherein seeds are to grow. Faith in time is surely a tremendous reality. We plant an acorn in our boyhood and the currents of life drift us away for sixty years. We visit the scene of our childhood, and find the tree with its branches toward the sky and its leaves a shelter from the heat. What a change! Think of the helpless, cowed, and shivering natives of Africa landed upon the shores of New England and Virginia in the early days of our Colonial history—look at their children to-day. What a change! Christianity believes in planting seeds, and watering and praying and waiting, in the faith that the seeds will grow. Faith in God, faith in human nature as He made it, and faith in time as illustrated in every field of human experience, justify the calm expectation and sure hope of the final and the universal prevalence of Christianity among all the races of mankind.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON.

Sixth Topic.

METHODS OF THE CHURCH'S WORK IN EVANGELIZING THE SPECIALLY DEPENDENT RACES IN AMERICA.

(a) THE NEGRO RACE.

Second Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. G. ALBERT ORMSBY, D.D.,
BISHOP OF HONDURAS.

We are invited to consider to-day some of the methods employed by the Church of God in seeking to evangelize the Negro race.

The duty of the Christian Church to try to evangelize all the races of the world is clear, it rests on the solemn charge of Christ, "Go ye into the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." The fearless discharge of this duty "without respect of persons" shall reap its rich reward when the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdoms of Our Lord and his Christ, when there shall be gathered round his throne that "great multitude

which no man can number of all nations, kindreds, people, and tongues." We therefore can rejoice to-day that amidst all the difficult problems that surround the past history, the present position, and the future prospects of the Negro race, amidst all the storms and conflicting currents of public opinion on the political and social aspect of questions relating to those people, we are in smooth waters when we try "to win them to Christ." Let us remember that we are not asked to solve political or social problems, but we are solemnly commanded to perform our spiritual duty, and let us reverently pray that every ripple on the surface of the stream of this our duty may forever pass away—and that "the Spirit of the Living God may brood on the face of the waters."

As the question of our duty is most thankfully recognized, we are only asked to-day to consider the best methods to be adopted in order to carry out our object in view.

1. First, then, I apprehend we must clearly agree as to what we mean by evangelizing the Negro race. What is our definite object?

2. Secondly, we must agree on certain fixed principles.

3. Among all the agencies we may suggest when we come to the discussion of the methods to be used, we must agree that *one* agency is indispensable—no matter what other agencies may be employed.

4. And then, when we have agreed on these points, I may suggest some methods that, with others more valuable, suggested by my Right Reverend Brethren, may form the basis for a profitable discussion this afternoon.

I. First, then, what do we mean by the expression "evangelize the Negro race?"

Surely it is something much more than simply to proclaim the evangel of God. I am quite aware that some of our most spiritually-minded brethren may say "Preach the word and leave the results to God." We thankfully recognize that in one point of view, "The word of God is quick and powerful," and that we have nothing to do with results—but in order to do any real work we must have our object in view clearly defined, and that object I take to be "the formation of character"—by character I mean the expression and the fruit of our apprehension of God's love to us in Christ, and the reflection of that love in the government of self and in our conduct towards our fellow men.

Professor Peabody of Harvard University, in his very able book entitled "An Examination of the Teachings of Jesus in Relation to Some of the Problems of Modern Life," regards with much hopefulness the present tendency to turn to the task of interpreting and perpetuating the teaching of Jesus. The modern spirit inquires "What would Jesus say?" In considering the difficult questions that surround the expression "Kingdom of God," he comes to this conclusion, "that whatever the phrase may

mean, or whatever may be included within its meaning, it implies a condition in which character rules supreme."

Our definite object in view is so to bring men and women into personal contact with the Living Christ that at last they may in some measure reflect His character. He must come into his garden and weed out all that offends. He must use the knife unsparingly that the fruitful branch may become more fruitful still. He must come into His Temple, once the "palace of Satan," now the "temple of the Holy Ghost," and cleanse it through and through, and again and again. He must come into His barn and with His winnowing-fan must thoroughly purge His floor. He must sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and must never be content till He sees in the purified metal His own kind face reflected as in a sea of glass.

II. Secondly, we must agree on certain fixed principles as we approach the subject of methods to be employed. As the Negro races whom we seek to evangelize, though one in blood, are very different in temperament and disposition in different countries, so we must recognize the principle (*a*) of adaptability and great flexibility in the methods we think best to employ.

The Negroes of North America differ from those of the South, and the Negroes of the Mainland of Central America differ from those of Jamaica, Barbadoes, and the other West Indian islands. The methods of the Church in dealing with them must therefore vary with the environment, capabilities, dispositions, and previous opportunities of the particular sections of the race we are seeking to influence—we must also take into account the climatic influence of the countries in which we are called to labor. Again we must not only recognize the principle of adaptability in the methods we propose to employ, but we must never forget another most important principle—(*b*) namely, that as our aim is spiritual, so everything calculated to emphasize race prejudice must be avoided, and the political element must never mingle with, nor in one iota interfere with our deeply spiritual work; here, as ever, we must be very faithful to God, to our own conscience, and to our brother. The Gospel's evangelical message of "Him who is no respecter of persons," when driven home to our hearts and indelibly written on our minds by the power of the Holy Ghost, must influence our conduct, and make us, whatever our race or nationality may be, better citizens, kinder brethren, and more fitted to fill the place that has been appointed for us in the wonderful plan of the great Architect of the world.

III. Again, among the many agencies we may suggest, we must agree (in the presence of God) on the indispensability of one agency as supreme—some may be lawful, others may be expedient, but the agency I am about to speak of is absolutely indispensable. I mean of course the preventing, co-operating, and sealing power of God the Holy Ghost. This must be especially empha-

sized in such days as these. All who look around them and try to read the signs of the times must be persuaded that we are living in the last days. The Holy Ghost has wrought more wonders in bringing souls into the Kingdom of God in the last one hundred years than were effected in the first four centuries of the Christian Church. In those happy days there was the personal presence of Christ, the personal teaching of the Apostles, the great Pentecostal blessing. Yet, owing to the forward movements of to-day all along the line, the Holy Spirit in answer to prayer is more largely than ever being poured out on men. The actual number of adherents to Christianity is being more largely increased. The argument from statistics is nothing to be compared to argument to be derived from the silent influences of "the old, old story," told and retold in the world. In India, China, Corea, and Japan, and among parent races of Negroes in Africa, the influence of Christianity is undermining the strongholds of heathendom.

This is pre-eminently the age of the Holy Ghost, we all have heard, and some of us are members of the great League of Prayer that has been formed for the special object of sending up one united prayer from every part of the world for a special outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The League representatives in almost every land, we take as our watchword the promise "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh." This spiritual work we are now considering must be done by spiritual agencies; "not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord."

Let us, then, earnestly pray, as we consider the methods to be employed, "Oh, God, who didst teach the hearts of thy faithful people by the sending to them the light of thy Holy Spirit, grant us by the same Spirit to have a right judgment in all things."

IV. We now approach the discussion of the methods that may be proposed. Bearing in mind the principles I have laid down, that our own methods must be flexible and capable of adaptation, and in their development anything tending to emphasize unhappy race prejudices or political opinions is to be avoided, it seems to me that our methods may be considered as:

1. Parochial. 2. Special. 3. Individual.

1. In a settled community nothing can be compared with our ordinary parochial system when interpreted on the principles I have already indicated. Among a very emotional people, while the love of God is plainly taught, and the far-reaching benefits of the atonement wrought by Christ are clearly explained, the practical side of religion should have marked prominence. Discipline should be very firmly and yet kindly enforced, and the integrity of the teachers and the examples of their lives should be ever considered as a most important factor in our work. We should steadily keep our object in view, namely, the formation of the Christlike character in the lives of those among whom it may be our privilege to labor. I much prefer myself steady,

quiet, and persevering work, and house to house visitations, to sensational movements, or emotional revival services. Let there be more prayer, more unity, more dependence on the power of God, more clear and plain and direct preaching, more calling sins by their right names, more exercising the Church's discipline with no respect of persons. Let those in high places be reprimanded as well as those in more humble spheres. If the tide of spiritual life is low in an organized community, let this be a call for prayer and the earnest examination of the methods actually in use. The weapons of our warfare are not carnal. All our methods must be spiritual, that is, they must be such as we honestly believe St. Paul would have used and our Lord Himself would sanction. I may add that I most thankfully include under the heading of parochial organizations the methods adopted with so much success by the Brotherhood of St. Andrew and the Church Army. I would also most warmly welcome any well-considered system by which the people can be elevated and taught by means of agricultural and technical schools.

2. In addition to methods that may be called parochial are those which are of an exceptional and special character. In virgin soil where there may not be as yet any settled ministers, the itinerating evangelist must be employed. It is not necessary that he should be a university man, but he should be fully equipped for his work, and must, of course, hold a license from the Bishop of his Diocese and be under the supervision of the clergyman of the nearest settled parish. A well-informed, spiritually minded man of their own nationality will often be found to be the best itinerating missionary in scattering and remote districts. Here again let us ever remember that the example of the teacher is the object lesson of the taught.

3. Again, methods must be devised whereby there may be more personal and individual dealing with men and women, one by one. Opportunities should be given for those in temptation, or in sin, to open their minds to their spiritual guides. I am not advocating sacramental confession, but I do think there should be much more spiritual contact between the clergy and the people than there is—an unburdening of the conscience means very much. How can counsel be given unless we know the special need? In special cases the advice of the Church of England is good. "Let him come to me or to some other learned and godly minister of God," not to receive absolution as from him, but to receive counsel, direction, and advice. In dealing with individuals of this race he must be taught the supreme importance of the government of self by the aid of the grace of God. In self-conquest all other spiritual conquest is involved. Well did Lord Tenynson say:

"Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control;
These three alone lead men to sovereign power."

In the window of a room in Queen's College, Oxford, is an inscription recording that the room was once used by our young hero Prince Henry V., who is finely described by the words *Victor hostium et sui*. "Conqueror not only of his enemies, but of himself."

In a word, let us see that all our methods, whatever they may be, tend to the formation of the Christlike character by the power of the Holy Ghost. If, my Right Reverend Brethren, we could put all our diocesan, all our parochial, all our various methods into the keeping of the Holy Spirit of God and let Him work, mighty work would be indeed accomplished. Sometimes, when we look around us, we are inclined to ask in despair "can these dry bones live?" Oh, let, us, then, listen for the answer—"With God, all things are possible." Let us do our part, teach the people and pray earnestly to God, "Come from the four Winds, oh, Breath, and breathe upon these slain, and they shall live."

Our methods can do much: "bone can come to its bone," sinews will bind them together, flesh and the beautiful form of a perfect humanity may cover them above, but we can do no more. "Paul may plant and Apollos may water, but God alone can give the increase." But of this we may rest assured that if we honestly, humbly, and in dependence on God do our part He will do His, and in His own good time we shall hear the rushing of a mighty wind, the spirit of the living God will fill the valley, and the spiritually dead, whom, by our methods, we are trying to awaken shall arise to a new and better life and "shall stand on their feet a great army."

We look forward to the time when our methods for the evangelization of the Negro race will be crowned with such glorious success that those whom we have evangelized in the land of their adoption shall in numbers return to their fatherland, and bring to the parent race the message of the Gospel they have learned from us. An old tradition tells us that one of the Magi who worshiped before the Infant Jesus was representative of this race from Africa. The prophecy was then fulfilled, "The Kings of Tarshish and of the Isles shall bring presents. The Kings of Sheba and of Seba shall offer gifts." So, by these hallowed means, the children ministering to the parents, the further prophecy shall also be fulfilled, "Thy sons shall come from far, and thy daughters shall be nursed by thy side. The multitudes of camels shall cover thee. The dromedaries of Media and Ephraim, all they from Sheba shall come, they shall bring gold and incense, and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord." The stream of life shall flow back from America to Africa. "The brook shall become a river, and the river shall become a sea."

FRIDAY MORNING.

Sixth Topic.

METHODS OF THE CHURCH'S WORK IN EVANGELIZING THE SPECIALLY DEPENDENT RACES IN AMERICA.

(b) THE INDIAN RACES.

First Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. CAMERON MANN, D.D.,
BISHOP OF NORTH DAKOTA.

The circumstances and conditions in which the Indians find themselves in Canada and in the United States are very different. There less than 100,000 Indians, here over 300,000; there a comparatively sparse population of white people, here 70,000,000; there an emigration toward the Indian country, which, while large, is quite controllable, here an onrushing multitude of land-seekers which is practically irresistible; there a form of government which recognizes, perhaps cultivates, a paternal spirit toward the weak, here a form of government which practically says to every man, "Take care of yourself." It is well that we are honored by the presence of a bishop from that part of America, and that you are to hear the views of so competent a judge.* Our sister Church on the north of us has done heroic and effective work, such as has rarely been excelled.

As for myself, I have had so many times the privilege which I now enjoy—that of presenting the Indian work, in one or other of its phases, before a sympathetic and intelligent audience—that I fear that anything I may now say will seem, to some at least, a thrice-told tale. And, moreover, so easy is it to perceive what ought to be done and yet not to follow it, to know the right spirit and not to have it, that I should not be at all surprised if, even should I succeed in pointing out right methods in evangelizing the Indians, I should only expose my own shortcomings and provoke the criticism that I describe and commend just what I have failed to be and to do.

"Methods" can hardly be separated from the inner life of which they are the movement, nor from the spirit which directs them, and I must be pardoned, therefore, if I seem to run back and forth from methods to spirit and life, and from spirit and life back to methods.

It will be seen as I proceed that I think that the methods of the Church in evangelizing the Indians need to be in some ways

* The Bishop of Calgary.

peculiar. I shall have to speak of the wisdom of keeping Indians as much as possible by themselves while they are still novices in Christian thought and life; of bringing religion to them in their own language; of honoring whatever may be good in their old modes of thought and action. All such methods may be called reservations; but in my opinion all "reservations" in behalf of the Indians must be considered as but temporary expedients. Everything should be looked upon as provisional, as shifts, which, if permanently maintained, would tend to make Indian life something separate from the common life of our country—a solid foreign mass—indigestible by our common civilization. Just because Indian life has been an indigestible mass, has our civilization been all these years constantly trying to vomit it and so get rid of the cause of discomfort. Ordinary laws must have their way. All reservations, whether the reserving of Indian land from the free passage to and fro of the people generally or from the ordinary laws of settlement; or the reserving of the Indian nationality from absorption into ours; or the reserving of old tribal superstitions and notions and habits from the natural process of decadence; or the reserving of the Indian language from extinction—are only necessary evils or but temporary expedients. Safety for 300,000 Indians, divided up into several hundred tribes, speaking almost one hundred different languages, scattered on about seventy different reservations, among 70,000,000 of English-speaking people, can be found only if the smaller people are led to flow in with the current of life and ways of the larger. The Indians are not an insulated people like the islanders of the South Sea. Our proper method of work is not that which builds up a national Indian Church with a national liturgy in the Indian tongue, but rather that of resolving the Indian structure and preparing its part for being taken up into the great whole in Church and State. However much therefore the missionary may, for the time being, have to devote himself to one class, namely, the Indians, he should struggle against falling into the notion that he is a missionary to Indians alone and not a missionary to all men, and his aim should be to break down the "middle wall of partition" between whites and Indians, and to seek not the welfare of one class or race, but the common good.

As a further preliminary remark, let me say that Indian missions call for the hardest kind of work and the hardest kind of sense. It will not be done by people who think that every Indian girl is a Pocahontas. The work must be thoroughly human and sympathetic: it must make allowances; it must be appreciative of any good in the Indians; but the Indians must not be seen as in a mirage—though mirages be common in the desert which he frequents—nor uplifted from the ordinary run of things and "floating vague in the ether." I am, perhaps, not as confident in my opinions regarding the Indians as I was as a novice thirty

years ago, but this I am sure of, the work calls for hard work and hard sense. I have seen nothing to lead me to think that there is anything in the Indian problem to drive us to mere sentimentalism, to quackery, or to despair. It will find its solution, under the favor of God, in the faithful execution of the powers committed by God to the civil government, and in a common-sense ministration of the offices and the gracious gifts deposited with His Church.

Next I should say the methods should be on the highest plane of Christian endeavor. The work lies among those whose confidence has been abused and perhaps destroyed. It can be regained only by persons of high sense of justice and sustained nobility of feeling. Moreover, the Indian is our helpless ward. Helplessness calls for persons of strong paternal feeling—not paternal feeling so-called, which makes one merely fond and indulgent, but the paternal feeling which makes one pitiful, patient, wise, and strong. I read some time ago in a newspaper the following words called forth by gross abuses in the treatment of the inmates of certain State poor-houses and hospitals. "The vast majority of men and women are not fit to exercise authority over other beings whose condition is one of entire dependence. There are some noble natures in whom helplessness will only breed respect, consideration, and true charity; but these are few and far between, indeed, and it is not disparaging ordinary human nature in the least to say that their price is above rubies." All this is emphatically true of workers among our native races. "Men who have passed all their lives in low and vulgar life," even though good, are rarely suited to this work. They are apt to be elated by being placed in authority over the ignorant and helpless and free from the balances and checks which a clergyman finds among white people. The Maoris, we are told, quickly noticed the difference between the noble-minded and the vulgar missionaries who came among them, and their comment was, "Gentlemen-gentlemen don't mind; pig-gentlemen mighty particular."

Next the methods should be such as to give the missionary strong Church backing. It being presumed that the missionary is the right sort of man, he should not owe his place, or his living, in any way to political favor or to local government officers, nor be dependent on them in any way except so far as a gentleman may receive courtesies from a gentleman, and so far as one who is in close touch with the needy may look with manly trust to those who command resources. There are in the Indian country representatives of the government, Indian agents and others, whom I am happy to call my friends, and in whose family life I have found many a time sweet solace. The Indian service is on a distinctly higher plane than it was when I first knew it; but many parts of the Indian country are infested with persons who are the most unscrupulous schemers and villainous land-grabbers—even government officials sometimes deserve this name. Nothing suits the purpose of such

persons better than to have the representatives of religion tied to their string.

Further: the methods should inspire confidence in the beneficent strength of the Church. The Indian has had experience of strength—often bitter experience. He knows well the strength of the white man's gun; the strength of his well-built houses, great cities of them; the strength of his enterprise in subduing the wild and turning over in a few weeks hundreds of thousands of acres of virgin sod; the strength of his railroads running over hill and dale and bridging mighty rivers. There has been handed down among them, generation after generation, the story of the irresistible progress of the white man. "A great people, and a strong. A fire devoureth before them; and behind them a flame burneth." The Indian admires strength, while in this case he fears it; but, alas! while so many other things of the white man are strong, his beneficent effort seems to the Indian transient and weak. A mission is begun. A missionary appears. He lacks good sense. The local enemies of religion make him a laughing-stock. He has not succeeded anywhere else; he does not succeed here. He withdraws. A mission building was erected. Now it stands unoccupied. This is a staggering blow, and, if possible, should never be permitted, therefore never accept any man except the right man. But when the right man has taken hold, never let him go. What he has begun, carry on. If driven away by irresistible forces, let him bide his time and then appear again upon the scene.

And yet again, the methods used should be those which tend to keep the Indian strong if he has any strength, and make him strong if he lacks it. The wild Indian has a certain strength, strength in the use of his religious nature, strength in the use of his physical nature.

As to the physical strength of the Indian. Who could cover long distances on foot, who ride a horse, who drive an arrow through the buffalo, who make wild nature serve his purposes better than he? The greatest danger to this strength is his becoming a loafer and a pauper. No one believes that a loafer and pauper is strong. The Indian does not believe it himself. He is not strong. To save the Indian's strength, the mission should take a distinct stand in favor of productive occupation—work in farming, in raising stock, in handicrafts, and in other pursuits which strengthen his body and bring in returns. Such texts as the following should occupy a very prominent part of public and private exhortations: "Go to the ant, thou sluggard; consider her ways, and be wise; which having no guide, overseer, or ruler, provideth her meat in the summer and gathereth her food in the harvest." And "How long wilt thou sleep. O sluggard? When wilt thou rise out of thy sleep? Yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep; so shall thy poverty come as one that traveleth, and thy want as an armed man."

"Even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat." And no pains should be spared to bring vividly before the Indians, on the one hand, the despicable condition into which many of them are sinking, and on the other, the honorable and well-to-do place which many others are securing by patient and intelligent effort. No native should hold a position on the mission force who will not try to make himself an example in these things.

So much as regards the physical strength of the Indian. As to his old religion, it was a great fact and a great power in his life. It had its sacred stories which fed the religious instinct. The changes of the seasons and the events of individual and social life were marked by holy rites, made attractive by singing, processions, and dances. But the whole system goes to pieces in the presence of civilization and Christianity. The people are disconcerted and perplexed. They lose all faith. They know not which way to turn. They are helpless. They become hopeless. They become reckless and do desperate deeds, or they become broken-hearted and sink into pauperism, loathsome disease, and death.

Let the religious gatherings be strong and convey a sense of strength. I should say, therefore, be sure that, at first at least, the gatherings are thoroughly homogeneous, that is, that only Indians are present; or, at least, only those who are like-minded with the missionary and sympathetic. Have no staring spectators, especially none of our brazen race. The Indian is shy. Such heterogeneous presence tends to weaken. I attribute any success met with in South Dakota largely to the fact that provisionally a large body of comparatively homogeneous Indians was opened to our endeavors and that we succeeded in gathering a large number of congregations—they number ninety—who come together in convocation by the thousand and go away feeling their power. If the tribe to be worked with is small, the difficulties are much increased. I should say overcome the smallness of numbers by intensity in spirit and effectiveness in methods. What you lack in extensiveness make up by saliency and point. Let the church building be a good one, the vestments brilliantly white and pure, and the music confident—better strong and rude than artistic and timid. Let the bishop and some of the outside clergy occasionally visit the mission (more frequently than once a year), and appear with the missionary in solemn procession. In the case of the small tribe practical beneficence has peculiar value, and it should take, in my opinion, the form not of schools only, but give more incontrovertible evidences of kindness, such as provision for the sick, and the old, and the helpless poor. It is a striking fact that the success of the Messiah is assigned by the Psalmist to such beneficence. "For," he says, "He shall deliver the poor when he crieth, the needy also and him that hath no helper."

An Indian mission should therefore meet the Indian just where he is; appropriate what is good in his religion and take it up into the fuller and newer life of our religion. To use a scriptural figure, "The wild olive should be grafted into the tame olive tree," and our religion should be presented to him in a way to enlist his imagination and encourage his heart. The religion which has its Bible stories, its outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace, its sacred seasons, its solemn liturgy and ritual, can, in the hands of experts, readily do all this. An Indian once saluted me with this confession: "We Indians have no paper from God [he meant no written revelation], but we pray to God, and, when we think we have anything that will please Him, we offer it to Him and ask Him to have pity on us." Who could rebuff an Indian's religion after a salutation like that?

Of course the three manuals which the Church puts into the hands of her children—the Bible, the Prayer Book, and the Hymnal—should be committed to the Indians, if possible, in their own language, and as all of them in the early days of the mission among them, and many of them to their lives' end, will not be able to read and write, the memorizing of the most important parts of these manuals should be made an important part of their Christian training. There should be services in which the whole congregation should be trained in saying audibly together sacred words and in assuming postures suitable to worship.

Further, to preserve and develop the Indians' strength, give them sufficient opportunities of putting forth this strength spontaneously and freely in meetings in which they shall seem to themselves to be prime movers. No dependent people, whether of the Indian or of the colored race, will do their best if they are so outnumbered and overshadowed—much less if they are so overborne—by the superior race that their proper self-confidence is undermined and their own initiativeness and freedom of thought and expression hindered. Such a relation puts them in a disconcerting, embarrassing, enfeebling position of conscious nobodies. Let them have their own convocations. Let one of their own number be their presiding officer—at least in the absence from the chair of the bishop, and that absence, I should say, should frequently occur. Let them assert their wills in the election of their officers. Let them freely express their minds by debating questions and passing resolutions. To most persons passing resolutions is as satisfactory as making laws, and often quite as effective.

This plan has been followed in South Dakota with marked success, though the Indian convocation there is made up of those who a few years ago were known everywhere as the turbulent and warlike Sioux, and though the native clergy stand to the white clergy in the ratio of 16 to 6, and the Indians outnumber the whites more than one hundred times, and though the convoca-

tions are held in the wild country, far away from the influence of the white man's greatness, all the proceedings move along with admirable decency and good order.

Now, speaking more broadly, let all methods be inspired and pervaded by a generous human spirit. In other words, let there be identification with the subjects of our effort. This is an essential of Christian work always, everywhere, and among all classes. The fundamental of our Christian faith is the identification of the Son of God with the subjects of His interest. "He took manhood into God," and if He did this in His person He did it also in His life. He put Himself on a level with the woman of Samaria, identified Himself with her by asking a favor, "Give me to drink," before He undertook to touch the sore place in her heart. It was this Christ living in him that made St. Paul identify himself with the people of Lycaonia and say, "He gave *us* rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness." Our religion is a ladder whose top, to be sure, reaches unto heaven; but only as we enable men to see it set up on earth right alongside them, as God placed the ladder alongside Jacob in his vision, will men realize that our religion is for each one the gate of heaven. A well-meaning tract distributor once told me of his discomfiture by reason of failure to practice identification. As he passed along through the market he handed a butcher a tract. The butcher called after him, "Say, mister, have you read it yourself?" And as he had not read it he beat a quick retreat.

So far as my observation goes, nothing has more marred and vitiated missionary enterprise both at home and abroad than lack of just this fellow-feeling with the subjects of missionary efforts—lack of quick ability to appreciate and ready power to do whatever is required by circumstances. This is the special infirmity of our Anglo-Saxon stock. There is a certain obtuseness which makes us fail to feel the situation. There is a proud unwillingness to put ourselves in the other man's place and to see with his eyes, yea, a haughty denial that any sentiment can be sacred unless it be our sentiment; that anything can be a real conviction and have any power with another unless it be our conviction and have power with us. The undertaking to open a man's eyes to the fact that he and all whom he loves and reverences most have been in error, to turn a man from modes of thought and habits of action which are dear to him, must always be a delicate task. It is hard to save it from being an exasperating process. The personality of the missionary is often unattractive to a man of different race. The foreigner, though an expert linguist, rarely appreciates the delicate turns of expression and other rhetorical processes by which speech is saved from rudeness and given the form of delicate suggestiveness and not of absolute assertion. And yet we are disposed to stand off as their critics from the people whom we are called to serve, and to discuss their racial

and natural and personal peculiarities in letters to newspapers and magazines. Even our petitions for them in intercessory prayer sometimes take on a condescending and patronizing air, which is particularly offensive when it is applied to the rulers of the foreign land where the missionaries are in a certain sense guests, lowering the rulers before their own people by praying publicly for them that they may be turned from darkness unto light and from the power of Satan unto God. Lecky, in his book, "The Map of Life," has shown that the event which he terms "the awful mutiny" in India, which for a time shook the English power there to its very foundation, took its rise in just this defect. "It was simply a glaring instance of indifference, ignorance, and incapacity too often shown by British administrators in dealing with beliefs and types of character wholly unlike their own."

Cow's fat and lard were used in the lubricating mixture with which the cartridges issued to the Sepoy soldiers were smeared, "one of these ingredients being utterly impure in the eyes of the Hindoo, and the other in the eyes of the Mussulman. To bite these cartridges would destroy the caste of the Hindoo, and carry with it the loss of everything that was most dear and most sacred to him both in this world and in the next. In the eyes of both Moslem and Hindoo it was the gravest and most irreparable of crimes, destroying all hopes in a future world, and yet this crime, in their belief, was imposed upon them as a matter of military duty by their officers." What had seemed to be the unalterable devotion of the Sepoy regiments gave way under this strain, and they retaliated in the most horrible excesses.

In missionary annals the story is famous of Corman, the first missionary bishop sent to the Northumbrian English. Harsh and unsympathetic, he met with no success, and returned in disappointment to his monastery and reported the English as stubborn and barbarous. "Hard with hard makes no wall," says Fuller quaintly, quoting the old proverb, "and no wonder if the spiritual building went on no better, wherein the austerity and harshness of the pastor met the ignorance and sturdiness of the people." He was succeeded by Aiden, a man of very sympathetic spirit. He had the art of condescending to babes and feeding them with milk. He threw himself in with the people. He hated display and generally traveled on foot and gave himself to house-to-house visitation. A humble church of split oak, thatched with coarse grass, satisfied his ambition at first. He gathered the boys of the English about him that he might train them to be evangelists to their own people. No wonder he is said to have possessed a "singular charm of manner and address, which first won his hearers and then incited them to an imitation of his own virtues."

For every reason the missionary should drive himself to identify himself with the people to whom he is sent, and avoid

presenting his particular, perhaps crude, views to the heathen in such a way that they seem to them as "the cow's fat and lard" seemed to the Mussulman and Sepoy.

As part of his identification with his people the missionary should be their confidant on any subject pertaining to their personal or material welfare, to their relation to each other, or their relation to the authorities, so far as any of the people may choose to call him to their confidence—being very careful, however, that he is not so ready to receive confidences as to come to be regarded as a sort of common sewer into which anyone may dump his filth, nor so ready to give credence to complaints and communicate them to others as to make himself a nuisance. At the same time, missionaries should confine themselves as much as possible to their own calling and their own sphere of work, and not consider themselves inspectors of government officials among the Indians, any more than a good citizen, occupying the office of a clergyman among the whites, should consider himself a universal *censor morum* and a judge of civil officials there. He should bear in mind that honor and obedience are due to government officials because of their office, and that he can do no more injurious work than to breed a spirit of discontent and sedition; and remember also this fact, that anyone who stands off and thinks how a work should be done will always be a mere critic and a hypercritic. We always think that we can do another man's work better than he does it. There is a deal of wisdom in the sarcasm, "Old maid's children are always well brought up."

Another help to identification will be the use of the native tongue, often a very difficult, nay, an impossible thing, as many tribes of Indians number but a few hundred, and the languages are many. (In North America alone there are sixty distinct linguistic stocks.) But what is much dearer to a man than the native tongue in which he was born? The missionary is after the man. The mind and the heart are the man. How can you reach the mind and the heart of the man except with the language that he knows and loves? Some missionaries have doubtless clung to the native language too much and too long. Government officials, on the other hand, rarely recognize sufficiently the value of the native tongue—perhaps because they have so much to do with the outside of the man and so little to do with his mind and heart. It is a strange thing, certainly, when, as sometimes happens, a government official forbids the missionary to speak to Indian children in their own tongue when gathered in church or school, and yet, when he wishes particularly to make those very children understand, asks the missionary to interpret for him!

As another element of identification, let me mention the raising up and employment of a staff of native workers. The natives will, of course, often lack the power of initiative, the sustained energy, the knowledge of the world and of affairs, and especially

the mental equipoise of the Anglo-Saxon; but they know their own people as no one else can, and making use of them will bring with it many advantages.

First, this method of working meets the Indians on their own plane; second, it identifies them with ourselves, and ourselves with them, and shows that "place" is not reserved for the white race only; third, it makes use of and gives honor to men who, while they may have but little education, have good intentions, much tribal influence, and fair gifts of leadership; fourth, it multiplies assistants at comparatively small cost, and thus reaches the many widely separated little settlements of Indians who could not be ministered to by the clergy except very occasionally, say once a month; and, fifth, it raises up a body of workers in which suitable candidates for the sacred ministry may grow up and be tested.

These assistants need not be the regular teachers of the people. Their office may be rather that of pioneers and recruiting agents, to mingle with the people and conciliate them; to rally them in religious meetings, and to lead them in singing, and train them in the simpler portions of the Prayer Book service and in the Catechism. Let them speak also the word of exhortation. Then later, if they approve themselves, they may become senior catechists and wear an appropriate badge.

My theme has been methods, but, of course, methods of work have but one end, the bringing the Indian to the intimate knowledge and full possession of the Christ—Christ, bread of life to the hungry; Christ, water of life to the thirsty; Christ, light and life to them that sit in darkness; Christ, open door to those who grope in the dark; Christ, companion and example along life's pathway; Christ, the joy of the heart; Christ, the very elect of God, in whom God's soul delighteth.

Now to conclude. It has appeared, as I have pursued my theme, that the proper methods of approaching the Indians have been conceived of as embracing the Indian in the whole man—the Indian in his body, soul, and spirit—the Indian as a man to whom it is appointed to live, and a man to whom it is appointed to die, and so I have discussed methods of work without so much as raising the favorite question whether the Indian race is what is called a "dying race" or not. They have, by the bye, been called a dying race so long, and have so long survived and disappointed those who have called them a dying race, that one wonders that they do not turn to us as sick Charles II. is said to have turned to his attendants, and ask our pardon for "being such an unconscionable time in dying."

But whatever may be the lot of the Indians, duty still calls us to work for them. Suppose these people be designed by Providence to be hewers of wood and drawers of water; our duty is to fit them for that lot. Suppose they are to be merged in our more numerous race; our duty is to fit them for that absorption

by lawful and proper intermarriage, and so arrest the present vicious intermingling. Suppose they are to die out; our duty is to prepare them for a safe and decent departure. Our duty is the plainer, because the treatment which will fit them for any one of these ends will fit them for the others.

FRIDAY MORNING.

Sixth Topic.

METHODS OF THE CHURCH'S WORK IN EVANGELIZING THE SPECIALLY DEPENDENT RACES IN AMERICA.

(b) THE INDIAN RACES.

Second Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM CYPRIAN PINKHAM, D.D.,
BISHOP OF CALGARY.

The history of the Church's work among the various races and tribes of Indians found in North America exhibits the employment of methods of universal application as well as of those which have been found necessary owing to the special conditions and circumstances of the Indians.

Work for the colonist naturally led to work for the heathen, amongst whom he had settled. In the memorial presented to S. P. C. K. by Dr. Bray in 1698, within two months from the first meeting of that society, as to what was specially needed to be done for the colonists in their plantations, he speaks as follows in the last paragraph:

"And lastly, in order to convert the Indian nations, it seems a likely method could there be provision for the Education of some of their Youths, in Schools for that purpose, who, after a thorough instruction in the Christian Faith, might be sent back amongst their own natives, as ye properest persons to convert them, and deale with them for their souls' good: 'When thou art converted strengthen thy brethren.'"

Evidently the European missionary, with his Bible and Prayer Book, and an interpreter by his side, soon found how powerless he was in declaring to heathen Indians the things of God. And it became necessary, not only to learn the language of the tribe he was sent to, and, when he had made sufficient progress in it, undertake translations, and sometimes, as the late Bishop Horden, Archdeacon Mackay, and others have done, print and bind such translations in the first instance, but, above all, to secure as soon as possible efficient native help. Hence it is not surprising to find the first Bishop of Rupert's Land saying in his ser-

mon at the ordination in 1850 of Henry Budd, the first native clergyman for his vast diocese:

"This day is an earnest of better things. One from among them is now before you, already blessed in turning many to righteousness. . . . If I be not an apostle to others, yet doubtless I am to you, my Indian brethren; for, among yourselves, one stands forth to say: 'Send me as an herald to my own kinsmen, according to the flesh; send me to beseech them, In Christ's name be ye reconciled to God.' And in 1852, at the ordination of James Setter, the second Indian clergyman in the diocese: 'Trained in our schools you are familiar with our thoughts and feelings, and instructed in the compass of Scripture; and familiar, too, with the thoughts and feelings of the Indian, you bring salvation near to him, looking back on the method by which God enlightened your own soul.'"

The value of having translations made and books printed in the language of the Indians was soon learnt. The first Bible printed in America was the Indian version of the Holy Scriptures, translated by John Eliot, the apostle of the Indians of North America, and issued at Cambridge, Mass., about the year 1663.

The Bible Society has done excellent work by publishing the Holy Scriptures, or portions thereof, in different Indian languages. But S. P. C. K., as the list of its publications clearly shows, has been a constant and most invaluable friend to Indian work.

The foundation and organization of dioceses in the Ecclesiastical Province of Rupert's Land, in some of which the population still consists almost entirely of Indians, while in the rest there is a considerable number of Indians whose first bishops have been, in several instances, Indian missionaries of tried and approved experience, has given an impetus to the evangelization of the Indians and greatly multiplied the methods used for bringing them to Christ.

In Indian missions, the Church's work is carried on in much the same manner as in missions for white people. Sunday services are held regularly; there are regular celebrations of the Holy Communion, at which offerings are sought for general and special objects; week-day services, morning and evening, in some of our missions, especially when the Indians are at home; Sunday schools; Bible classes; and prayer meetings—all in the language spoken by the Indians. In some of the missions many of the Indians show great familiarity with Holy Scripture, and many of them regularly conduct Family Prayer. When the missionary is absent one of the best instructed Indians conducts divine service. At the Peigan Mission, in the diocese of Calgary, the newly converted Christian Indians take a special pride in their little church. They hauled the material for the building; some of them have given money towards its completion; while others

have donated articles of church furniture, chancel chairs, Altar rails, prayer desk, pulpit, and so on.

There is a steady effort made to convert the heathen, and among heathen Indians Christianity is steadily gaining ground.

Previously to their admission to Holy Baptism they are carefully instructed, and the instruction is carried on to Confirmation and Holy Communion.

Periodical visits are made by the missionary to outlying missions, and to the Indians when engaged in fishing and hunting.

Our Indian missionaries have been civilizers and colonizers; while teaching the truths of the Christian religion they have taught the Indians to farm, to cultivate their gardens, to take care of cattle, to build houses, and so on. And, with the preaching of the Gospel, the education of the young went hand in hand. St. John's College, Winnipeg, now one of the colleges in affiliation with the University of Manitoba, had its origin in the need Rev. John West felt, in 1820, for training Indian boys. Emmanuel College, Prince Albert, was started by the first Bishop of Saskatchewan, in 1879, from the sense of need entertained for a trained band of interpreters, schoolmasters, catechists, and pastors, who, being themselves natives of the country, would be familiar with the language and mode of thought of the people. Two of the native clergy, and most of the teachers of the Indian day schools in the diocese, received their training there.

Before treaty was made with the Indians of Manitoba and the Northwest territories, every Indian mission had its school and its teacher as well as its ordained missionary. The school was under the direction of the missionary, and the teacher was his lay-assistant, who sometimes, when the missionary was not fully conversant with the language, acted as interpreter. When the Government of Canada made treaty with the Indians it made itself responsible for the education of Indian children. In this work it has recognized the work of the various religious bodies by giving them control of those schools which were in existence when treaty was made, as well as of those which each body has since been able to induce it, through the Indian Department, to establish.

There are three kinds of Indian schools now in existence, viz., Industrial, Boarding, and Day Schools, all of them denominational. Indeed there are four, for the Indian Department recognizes and almost entirely supports Emmanuel College, Prince Albert, as an institution for the training of Indian boys and girls, with a view to them becoming teachers in the Church of England Indian day schools in the diocese. Industrial schools are wholly maintained by the Indian Department of Canada, but the provision made for the support of the day schools and boarding schools is inadequate, and the Church has been under the necessity of spending a considerable sum every year to supplement the outlay of the Indian Department. The Church nom-

inates all teachers in all its Indian schools. The principals of the Emmanuel College Indian training school of the Industrial Schools at Battleford and Calgary respectively, and of most of Indian Boarding Schools, are clergymen holding the bishop's license. The result of all this is that religious and secular education go on together, and the Indian schools all over Canada, in connection with the Church, are nurseries of the Church. They are annually inspected and reported on by officials of the Indian Department and they are doing excellent work.

But the object aimed at in the education of Indian boys and young men, in the Indian industrial schools of Canada, is greatly jeopardized by the want of any definite scheme for their future welfare, when they leave school. They are permitted to return to the Reserve to which they belong; and although some get along very well, a percentage of them fall back, and become in most respects no better than the lowest Indians on the Reserve. We see the evil of this, and some of us think a remedy can be provided, but it lies with the Indian Department, and the Church's influence so far has not been strong enough to induce the Department to grapple with the evil, and, if possible, remove it.

In the Ecclesiastical Province of Rupert's Land, the native clergy, of whom there have been from time to time a good number, are on precisely the same footing as all other deacons and priests in their respective dioceses. As long as they hold the bishop's license, they are members of the Diocesan Synod, and those who are priests are eligible for election on its committees, and as clerical delegates to the Provincial and General Synods.

Indian congregations are organized in the same manner, and all entitled to the same representation in our Diocesan Synods as congregations of white people. Indian lay-delegates, representing the congregations of which they are members, and elected by the male communicants of such congregations, have constantly sat in the Diocesan Synods of Rupert's Land and Saskatchewan. During the sessions of one meeting of the Synod of Calgary, a full-blooded Blackfoot Indian, who holds the Bishop's license as a catechist, represented the Blackfoot congregation. The late chief Attachkakoop, or Starblanket, was, on several occasions, elected a delegate to the Provincial Synod of Rupert's Land, by the Synod of Saskatchewan to which he was for many years a lay-delegate, but he never attended.

During recent years, since the establishment of medical missions, as one of the methods for bringing souls to Christ, hospitals have been established and medical work has been done for our Indians. There are hospitals at Lytton, in British Columbia; at Dynevor in Manitoba; on the Blackfoot Reserve, in the Diocese of Calgary, and at Moose Factory. At the St. Barnabas Home for native children, Onion Lake, Saskatchewan, the wife of the missionary, who is also principal of the Home, is an M. D., who at great self-sacrifice on her own part, and on that of her husband,

obtained her professional education. This lady not only ministers to the sick in the Home, she also attends the sick Indians and settlers throughout that part of the country when they need her services. There is a trained nurse on the staff of the Battleford Indian Industrial School and one in connection with the boarding schools on the Blood Reserve. In many other cases professional visits are made periodically and the Indians are treated in their own homes. Speaking of the hospital, and of the dispensing of medicine, Archdeacon Small of Lytton, B. C., says: "We regard this as one of the most practical ways of breaking down the influence of the proverbial Indian medicine man," and, he adds, "My present colleague has acquired in a short time a great hold upon the Indians, by means of his medical skill and experience."

There is no doubt that wherever in the heathen world medical work has been introduced, it has opened the way for the Gospel, and it has proved an inestimable blessing to our Indians, whether Christians or heathen.

In view of the probable publication of this paper, I append to this paper statistics, etc., for three years from January 1, 1899, to December 31, 1901, from the Triennial Report on Indian Missions of the Synod of the Ecclesiastical Province of Rupert's Land.*

FRIDAY MORNING.

Seventh Topic.

THE OBLIGATION OF THE CHURCH TO MAINTAIN THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY IN ITS INTEGRITY.

(a) DIVORCE AND UNLAWFUL MARRIAGE.

First Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM CROSWELL DOANE, D.D., LL. D.,
BISHOP OF ALBANY.

I am thankful to feel and free to say that we, in our American Church, have been sitting at the feet of God for all these years of discussion about this tremendous question of the Church's attitude toward the question of marriage and of remarriage, as I always prefer to put it, after divorce. And we have been learning the great lesson, which is so Godlike, of patience. And it has been the patience of progress, as all Godlike patience is. And the progress has been made in two ways and from two impulses. First, a deepening doubt, from more careful study of the Word of God, as to any warrant that can be found in it anywhere for

* These tables will be found in the Appendix to this volume, commencing page 171.

any remarriage after divorce; and secondly, the growing sense of the abominations which have come from the abuse of even the supposed non-prohibition. Whatsoever way men's minds have run, there is more and more a growing consensus that something needs to be done to arrest the spread of this evil, whether it be that the love of God is changing the minds of men, or that the wrath of men is working the principles of God. Either way, as St. Paul said, whether in pretense or in truth, so I say, whether from conviction on religious grounds, or from the compulsion of social security, either way Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice. It seems naturally unlikely that in the twentieth century that should become possible which for sixteen centuries before this has been impossible, namely, to have agreement on the same premises as to the lawfulness or unlawfulness of the remarriage of a man who has put away his wife for fornication. But it does not seem to me impossible, from different and opposite premises, to reach the same conclusion, namely, the courage, not of compromise, but of comprehension, the courage of leaving any seemingly irreconcilable utterances to be reconciled by God. The courage of silence where men cannot hear the voice of Christ distinctly and decidedly, however He may have spoken; the courage of realizing that the *ecclesia docens* is the teaching Church, in teaching that she dare not legalize by canon or promulgate as law one or the other interpretation of words, doubtful alike in their origin, their authority, and their intention.

Gathered as we are here, representing the great English-speaking portion of the Catholic Church, we have a common inheritance of worship in our Book of Common Prayer, and a common descent of discipline on both sides of the sea. And from the one we have in common the strong and Scriptural teaching of the office for the solemnization of matrimony, that the man and the woman are joined "till death do them part," and the strong and Scriptural warning in the uniform repetition of the words of our dear Lord, "Whom God has joined together, let not man put asunder." And while this Church in the United States, in her own independent power and right as a national Church, has legislated and is in process of legislating as to the discipline on this question, there is behind it the strong ground of the old teaching of the Church of England, from whose discipline, according to our own avowal in the Preface of the Prayer Book we have never meant to depart, driving us, as I believe, to the point on which the Church of England stands firm to-day in her ecclesiastical law, that marriage is only dissoluble by death. Before I pass to the argument by which this paper proposes to prove that the one way to protect the institution of Christian marriage is to define it and legislate according to that definition as one man united to one woman until the union is severed by death, there are some side issues, which I should like to eliminate from the discussion.

First, the ideal difficulty. It is said that the original divine description of marriage and our Lord's adoption of it as a general principle is an ideal, and not to be counted as a legal requirement or a practical possibility. To which the answer is that the one steady aim and duty of religion is to lift men up to the ideal and not to let the ideal down to men. The human life of Jesus Christ, whose legend always is "follow me," is the ideal toward which it is the duty of the Christian man to strain. To lower it in any of its details of teaching or example to our easy reach takes out of life its best ambitions and its highest aims. When the human law-giver lowered the old ideal "because of the hardness of men's hearts," it followed before very long that it was thought lawful to put away a wife for any cause, and when Constantine lowered it because of the intrusion of the half-Christianized world into the Church, the thing happened that always will happen, the steady downward steps by which the standard was lowered more and more.

Secondly, the sentimental difficulty. It is said that either a man or a woman, when mutual affection and respect have been destroyed by the unfaithfulness of wife or husband, is far more naturally inclined to a second marriage than when death has consecrated the memory of a faithful life, and that therefore the sentiment is far stronger against the idea of a marriage after widowhood than of a marriage after divorce. To which it is to be said that sentiment cannot overrule or override Divine law either in giving or in taking away the liberty of that law; that the one case is sin comforting itself by added sin, and the other is sorrow finding a consolation which the law of God allows.

Thirdly, the hardship difficulty. There is always hardship in the enforcement of law, and always hardship as the result of sin. When a law lays down penalties it does it in order to save people from the hardship consequent upon its violation. That in this instance the innocent may suffer for the guilty is in entire accord with the uniform facts of life. It is hard to believe that the real hardship, namely, that all unhappy marriage and unrestrained passion would not be lessened if not avoided, if it were realized from the beginning that the marriage bond could never be dissolved, and that people must therefore adapt themselves to it and avoid the things that make it hard to bear. And while for many reasons, some technical and some natural, the innocent party is hard to find, the awful element of collusion to secure divorce, and the outrage of the subsequent marriage between the parties who had committed the sin, enhance the horror of the situation to-day.

Fourthly, what I think I may call the academic difficulty, stated not for the first time here, but urged in the argument in the House of Deputies two years ago, somewhat in this way. "That the nations of Europe most lax in morals are able to point the finger of scorn at our frequency of divorce. May not

this anomaly of laxity of morals and no divorce in some countries, and comparative purity with frequency of divorce, cause us to study carefully the sociological conditions before we draw rash conclusions? May not divorce be simply the recognized and legal expression of sin that has been recognized in all history?" In answer to this, I am inclined to question the first premise. Impurity may be more flagrant in the Latin countries. I am not sure that it is more prevalent. With the aping of foreign manners and customs has come, conspicuously in people prominent in society, but extensively also where it is not so much known and seen, an adoption of foreign morals. In the next place, I am quite sure that the cause of whatever difference there may be is racial and climatic, and not due to anything connected with divorce. Roman Catholic Ireland, with divorce impossible, is conspicuous for the chastity of its women. But above all, let us beware of attempting to cure one sin by another. The proposal savors of the Hahnemann method, curing "like with like," a sort of ecclesiastical or moral homeopathy, of which I am afraid. Speaking legally and civilly, it seems monstrous to me that the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts has wiped out the time-honored distinction between separation from bed and board and the dissolution of the bond of marriage. So that any man or any woman appealing for necessary relief from insufferable conditions, to the Courts of that State, is forced, on the ground of drunkenness, or cruelty, or desertion, or the like, to ask for a dissolution of the marriage bond; and the result is that one divorce is granted to every fifteen marriages in the old colony founded by Bible-loving Puritans on the Plymouth Rock and the Pilgrim Fathers.

And lastly, the *ipso facto* difficulty. It is claimed that unfaithfulness dissolves the bond of marriage. But this means either that divorce is needless, except as a declaration of the existing condition, or it means that marriage is merely the mating of animals. And it means also, if it is logically pushed to its own conclusion, that the guilty party, who is much more likely to need and to seek remarriage, is equally free with the innocent party.

We have to deal in our own communion definitely with only three propositions that are taken, all of which agree entirely with one thing, namely, that there can be no possible permission of remarriage after divorce, except in one instance. They represent three distinct shades of thought and conviction; first, that there can be no remarriage after divorce for any cause arising after the marriage during the life-time of the other party; secondly, of those who so far doubt the legality that they dare not give such a marriage the sanction of the Church, and yet so far admit the possibility of the intention of our Lord's words as to fornication as to be unable positively to declare its illegality; and thirdly, of those who are so clear as to the exception as

divinely allowed, that they think it warrants the giving of the sanction and of the Sacraments of the Church in the case of this one marriage. It is, I believe, the opinion of a very large majority of our own bishops that any remarriage after divorce is so far doubtful that the Church cannot give it the sanction of allowing her clergy to solemnize it, while the rightful remarriage of the man whose wife is an adulteress is so far possible that she dare not refuse to admit to the Sacraments this person thus remarried. And the argument for this position runs so. I may be permitted without presumption to state the grounds familiar to the bishops who are here, even though there be some among us whom Mr. Keble describes as "wishing to live and die dutiful children of the Church of England, who believe, nevertheless, that they see in Holy Scripture all but a direct contradiction of the proof of her doctrine and discipline of marriage, namely, that marriage, once really contracted, is indissoluble by man." There are two undisputed and indisputable facts, I think, namely, that during two great and important periods in Church history the law and the use about remarriage are positive and clear. In Mr. Keble's sequel to his argument that the nuptial bond is indissoluble, and that divorce with remarriage was unknown in Christendom for three hundred years, he has fairly proved that there was almost a *consensus patrum* until A. D. 314 to the absolute indissolubility of marriage. And the first departure is at that marked and momentous period in Christian history of which I said some time ago that it might be variously described as the time when Constantine became Christianized or when Christianity became Constantinized. What are called the "Divine Institutions" of Lactantius, the tutor to Constantine's son, started by the statement that the tie of the marriage covenant may never be undone except when it is broken by faithlessness, and again, that he is an adulterer who, except for the cause of adultery, has dismissed his wife to marry another. Within seven years from this Constantine promulgated his law of divorce, which was a civil and not an ecclesiastical rescript, under the counsel of bishops who were either Arians or indifferentists, including four other grounds, "murder, sorcery, the violation of graves, and pandering to unchastity in others." The second undisputed fact is that following the course of her bishops in the Council of Arles, from the Norman Conquest through the Reformation, the Church of England, and until fifty years ago the State of England, never recognized divorce with the right of remarriage until forty years ago. Between these two points, the primitive and the Anglican, what occurs? In the East, Erastianism, going from bad to worse, allowed from one to four, from four to sixteen causes of divorce. And in the West, the Roman Church upheld nobly and boldly the sanctity of marriage, although, by the application of annulments and papal dispensations, she largely destroyed the practical value of her Catholic profession, because the law is

elastic, inclusive, and uncertain, since it includes prohibitions which made marriages unlawful from the first on grounds often unknown to the contracting parties.

The Bishop of Bristol makes this statement: "The artificial barriers to marriage which needed the Papal dispensation were so numerous and so complicated that the lawyers must have been dull who could not find some excuse for getting the marriage declared void because of the absence of dispensation. A person once a Roman Catholic has put the matter flippantly, but not untruly: 'The emperors and kings and dukes kept an Italian conjuror to turn wrong into right. The conjuror could legalize illegal marriages, and if they turned out ill he could unmake them. The King of England had always paid his share of the conjuror's maintenance.' I am always glad to remember that while not using Roman terminology as to the number of Sacraments, this Church does not deny the sacramental character of marriage.

In dealing with this question from the Scriptural point of view, I very strongly object to the position which is sometimes taken, and which has so high an authority as Canon Bright among recent writers, that the two passages in the Holy Gospel according to St. Matthew (the one in the Sermon on the Mount, and the other in the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel) ought to be dealt with as making the same statement. The whole question turns upon the right of remarriage after putting away. And the two statements which St. Matthew records deal, one merely with the subject of putting away without any reference to remarriage,—*"Whosoever shall put away his wife, save for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery,"*—while the other interjects the expression *"and shall marry another."* The fact to be gathered from the first is merely that our Lord allowed as the sole cause of putting away one cause, but it does not carry with it the idea that the putting away left either party to remarry. I confess it somewhat gratifies me to find that Canon Bright finds himself in this curious dilemma as the logical result of his opinion, which seems to me to add the chief improbability of all to the great improbability of our Lord's having ever given any permission to remarry after divorce for any cause. *"The adulterous wife,"* Canon Bright says, *"ceasing to be a wife, is free to marry again, and to marry whom she will, but if an innocent wife avails herself of the law of divorce and is released from the bond to her husband, she may not marry again."* *"That,"* Dr. Bright says, *"would be to commit adultery."* This seems to me a combination of Scylla and Charybdis.

Passing from historical facts to the Scriptural study, we are bound, I think, to realize that there are really only four words in one somewhat uncertain passage on which the theory rests. Without attempting to enter into any elaborate and detailed study either of text, of authenticity, or of interpretation, and entirely omitting, as not bearing upon this question, our Lord's

statement in the sixth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, there is in the nineteenth chapter an allusion to the possibility of remarriage after putting away.

I pass to a brief summary of the grounds on which I hold the view that by the teaching of Holy Scripture the marriage bond is indissoluble, that separation is permitted in one case only, but that no remarriage is possible under any conditions. The question turns, of course, upon the authenticity and meaning of our Lord's words in the nineteenth chapter of the Holy Gospel according to St. Matthew. Allowing that the words ought to stand, and that they mean what they seem to mean in the English version of the passage, the deduction from them in our present canon is based upon a series of inferences. At best they contain a negative non-prohibition, which it is proposed to turn into a positive permission. They refer only to the man putting away his wife, and are inferred to apply to the woman. And they use the word *πορνεία*, which is, to say the least, probably not the same as *μοιχεία*; the distinction between the two sins being expressed in the English as well as in the Greek by two different words. Then comes the question as to whether our Lord used these words, and when He used them, if He did, and with what intention; about which it must be remembered that in the Sermon on the Mount, as St. Matthew records it, there is no reference to remarriage. The text reads there, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, save for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery." And the words in the Greek are *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας*, which certainly means "apart from," "leaving to one side," "not considering the cause." The sentence then would mean, "Whosoever shall put away his wife [I am not speaking of fornication, which, if it means uncleanness before marriage, is provided for by the permission to annul the marriage, and if it means adultery, is provided for by the requirement to put the adulteress to death] causeth her to commit adultery." In the fuller statement that is contained in the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel the expression is apparently different. There is an allusion here to the possibility of remarriage after putting away. "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery." The words in the commonly received Greek text are *εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*. It is, to say the least, doubtful if our translators render these words accurately, for *εἰ μὴ* means probably "if not" or "though not" for fornication, which would make this not an exception, but an exemplification and illustration. But there is good reason to believe that the case is stronger than this. The Revisers in their note say, "Some ancient authorities read, as in Chapter V. 32," that is to say, as in the Sermon on the Mount. So also Lachman. And the Syriac translation, the famous Complutensian Edition, and such editors of the Greek text as Griesbach, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Mill,

Burton, such commentators as Grotius and Lucas Brugensis, and Selden and, before them, Chrysostom and Augustine omit the *ei* and read *μη*, which make synonymous and consistent our Lord's words here and in the Sermon on the Mount.

"Whosoever shall put away his wife [I am not speaking of uncleanness and unfaithfulness, which are provided for by another law annulling or putting away] and shall marry another committeth adultery." And the words, probably, be they exception or qualification, refer not to the marriage, but to the putting away, forbidding divorce; that is to say, for any but the one cause, instead of for the innumerable causes allowed by rabbinical accretions and additions to the law of Moses, but giving no permission to remarry. "Is it lawful," the Pharisees asked, "to put away for any cause?" And our Lord said, "No; only for one cause—uncleanness or unfaithfulness."

It is a striking evidence of the direction in which more careful, critical study advances that the editors of our Bible with Marginal Readings (adopted by the General Convention) put as a substitute in the margin for the ninth verse of the nineteenth chapter, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, *saving* for the cause of fornication, maketh her an adulteress." And this is done on the ground that out of the five leading manuscripts of the Gospels two only contain the passage clearly as it is in our Authorized Version.

It is a most weighty addition to this whole argument that all three Evangelists record the language of our Lord, as to the remarriage of the person put away or divorced, in the same sweeping terms,—"*Whosoever marrieth*,"—not the woman put away, which might mean the adulteress, but "*a woman*," any woman, "*put away*," or, as St. Luke has it, "*a woman put away from a husband*," committeth adultery. And this being true, it follows, that if no man can marry any woman put away from any husband without being guilty of adultery, it must be because the marriage bond is not dissolved by divorce, because she is still the wife of the husband who has put her away. The man cannot marry because he has a wife, and the woman cannot marry because she has a husband.

I need not remind you that St. Mark and St. Luke alike omit all reference to any exception to the rule. St. Luke, prefacing the unexceptional statement with the words, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the law to fail," turns back to another, and the strongest point of all, namely, our Lord's statement of the principle of marriage as a divine institution, which St. Matthew records in full, in the same chapter of his Gospel. The question was, Can a man put away his wife for any cause? and our Lord's answer is unequivocal. And he answered and said unto them: "Have ye not read, that He which made them at the beginning, made them male and female, and said, for this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave

to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder." This can mean but one thing, that He who instituted the sacred bond in the beginning, Who made it in the very terms of its institution mystical, reaffirms the fundamental principle of it, monogamy and indissolubility, one man and one woman, one flesh; "what therefore God has joined together let not man put asunder." The passages must be taken together. They relate and refer, all of them, to this restatement, reaffirmation, re-institution, which underlies the natural, the Mosaic, the Christian institution. And we can only so avoid, it seems to me, the fault and the failure of the Pharisees, who, "tempting Him," here as elsewhere, tried to "entangle Jesus in His talk." He cannot contradict Himself. Somehow, any seeming contradiction must be explicable. And the reconciling words, by which the exception which would contravene the principle of marriage, if it were what it seems to be, may be so understood as not to break the law of God; the reconciling words are "what therefore," because they are one flesh, "what therefore God has joined together let not man put asunder."

I do not think that in the ordinary discussion of the Scriptural presentation of this matter attention enough is called to St. Paul's witness, "And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband: But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband; and let not the husband put away his wife" (I Cor. vii. 10, 11), in which he says distinctly, "Not I, but the Lord." And it is as applicable to what he writes to the Roman Christians as asserting a well-known Christian law. "Know ye not, brethren (for I speak to them that know the law), how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband as long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free from the law; so that she is no adulteress though she be married to another man" (Rom. vii. 1, 2, 3). So that these two utterances, both unmistakable in their meaning, are not Pauline canons, but restatements and revelations to St. Paul by our Lord Himself, which had passed at that time into a well-known law of the Church, to which the apostle could appeal for the truth that only death dissolves the marriage bond.

The appeal to the Church on the ground that she is the *ecclesia docens* to decide this question, to teach the truth positively, peremptorily, and without a qualification, is asking this American branch of the Church to do what she has no warrant to do, what no general council of the Church has finally settled, and what

no uniform consent of her members during these nineteen centuries has been able to accomplish. Her mission, therefore, is to teach what she can most surely find established by the strongest warrant of authority; and if I can read rightly the collected teachings of the centuries, it must be this: that any remarriage after divorce is so far doubtful that she cannot give it the sanction of allowing her clergy to solemnize it; that the rightful remarriage of the man whose wife is an adulteress is so far possible that she dare not refuse to admit this person, remarried, to the Sacraments.

And the sum of what I have said I desire to put in plain and simple language, that all may know at any rate the outlying points of the argument. I group it under heads of several separate facts.

First, that the marriage relation, being at the foundation of the family, which is the foundation of the State, is a fundamental principle of all civilized and national life.

Secondly, that the alarming increase of divorce has become a serious threat to morality, decency, social stability, in this country and this age.

Thirdly, that the Canon Law of this Church to-day sets a higher standard than is set by the civil law of the States, or by the canon of any religious body, except the Church of England and the Methodist Episcopal Church in America.

Fourthly, that, judged either by its effect or by the authority on which it rests, it is not stringent enough.

Fifthly, that there is absolute agreement in this Church upon the one fact, namely, that divorce with remarriage can be possibly tolerated only in the one instance of what is called the innocent party in a divorce suit for adultery.

Sixthly, that it is impossible for anyone to affirm that the language in the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, on which this sole exception is grounded, is absolutely certain either in its authority or in its interpretation.

Seventhly, that this record is not only different from, but absolutely at variance with, other statements of our Lord upon this same subject, as recorded in the other Evangelists, especially with our Lord's acceptance of the original law of this primeval institution, namely, that "they twain are one flesh" and that "man may not put asunder what God has joined together."

Eighthly, that St. Paul's statement in both the Epistle to the Corinthians and the Epistle to the Romans clearly shows the position of the Apostolic Church and his own definite teaching from our Lord Himself, that only death dissolves the marriage bond.

Ninthly, that for the first three hundred years of the Primitive Church no such thing was known as remarriage after divorce.

Tenthly, that the Church of England, from the time of the

Norman Conquest to the present day, forbids such remarriages by her Canon Law.

Eleventhly, that the whole spirit of the marriage service of this Church maintains the indissoluble sanctity of the marriage bond.

Twelfthly, that to call this a hardship does not prove that it is not right; and it is no greater hardship than the necessary prohibition of divorce with right to remarry, for insanity, or life-long imprisonment.

And lastly, that where there is any least doubt upon a question of this importance, moral, religious, and social, the act of mercy is to safeguard the sanctity of marriage against any possible desecration, to keep man or woman from the possibility of the sin of a marriage otherwise than as God's Word doth allow, and to leave the door open for penitence, even after this gravest sin, to find pardon and restoration.

I am quite free to recognize that the American branch of the Church cannot do what she has no warrant to do, maintain as absolute and positively certain either view of the Scriptural utterances as to the possible legalness of remarriage after divorce; but she can, and I think she ought to, teach that there is such absolute and positive uncertainty as to the interpretation and meaning of this single passage, that she cannot sanction or allow her clergy to solemnize the marriage, while she will not refuse to admit the person, remarried after divorce for the one cause, by magistrates or other ministers, to the Sacraments.

The State has an undoubted right to declare that the civil contract of marriage can be canceled by the State. The Church has no power to dissolve the marriage bond. What she cannot undo, she ought not to be asked to deal with as though it was undone. And what the State cancels the State ought to be left to deal with. For all purposes of legality, these people, unmarried by the State, can resort to the magistrates and secure a civil contract of remarriage, but the Christian Church cannot with any consistency have part or lot in this transaction.

Resolutions on remarriage after divorce were presented, but not moved for adoption, because the Conference directed that no such resolutions should be moved for adoption against the will of three bishops.

Resolved, That the Church's attitude toward the questions of marriage and divorce, in order to protect the institutions of Christian marriage and the Christian family, should be a bold utterance of the sacred and mystical character of marriage based upon the primal revelation of its character as re-enacted by our Lord's own words, no more "twain but one flesh," "what therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder."

Resolved, That in the alarming prevalence of divorce and of the remarriage of divorced persons, the bishops assembled here

declare their conviction that while the Sacraments of the Church should not be denied to the innocent party in a divorce for adultery remarried, the sanction of the Church should not be given to any remarriage after divorce for any cause arising after marriage.

FRIDAY MORNING.

Seventh Topic.

THE OBLIGATION OF THE CHURCH TO MAINTAIN THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY IN ITS INTEGRITY.

(a) DIVORCE AND UNLAWFUL MARRIAGE.

Second Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. ARTHUR SWEATMAN, D.D., D.C.L.,

BISHOP OF TORONTO.

We are all agreed that the Christian family is of divine institution, designed not only for the healthful propagation of the race, but for the conserving and handing down from each generation to the succeeding the principles of righteousness, morality, and all virtues, especially for perpetuating the knowledge and worship of God in the earth.

The relationships of the family are of a sacred character, typifying those which subsist among the blessed persons of the Godhead, and which exist between God and man whom he has created and redeemed.

Family love, which mutually unites husband and wife, parents and children, brother and sister, and all to each, is of a higher kind than all other earthly loves, pure and holy, akin to the divine love.

Each Christian family is itself a Church, of which the head is the hereditary priest, to rule, to instruct in the knowledge of God, to guide in His ways, and to lead in His worship.

And upon the basis of the family as the unit, the whole Church is built up.

Regarding for instance a Church in its most strictly localized aspect, it is plain that its character is determined very largely by that of the families of which it is composed. Anything that serves to the disruption of the family or to defeat the purposes which it is intended to serve in the divine economy, is a distinct loss and injury to the Church, on the inevitable principle that if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it.

Hence the grave obligation which lies upon the Church in her corporate capacity to maintain the institution in its integrity, to legislate to this end with watchful jealousy, that the high ideal for which it stands be not marred or destroyed.

Among all the tendencies of the day which threaten to effect this disastrous result, the most perilous is that to make light of, impair, set aside the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Divorce and the making of unlawful marriages are questions which press themselves upon the consideration of the Church with an insistency that cannot be denied.

Marriage is the very foundation on which the Christian family stands, the tie which binds all its members together. Loosen the tie and the members fall asunder; take away the foundation and the fabric, so fair, so peaceful, standing for a witness of God's design for all that makes for human happiness and goodness, is hopelessly shattered.

When requested to prepare a paper on this subject for this august Conference, I did not feel called upon to attempt afresh the discussion of it upon its merits. The whole ground has been traversed again and again. All has been said that can be said. Every argument from both Testaments has been thoroughly discussed, the whole range of Patristic writings minutely searched for evidence, and the opinions of the Fathers extending over three hundred and fifty years marshaled on either side of the case the Canon Law of the Church bearing upon the question, as adopted by the councils extending from the Apostolic Canons in the second century to the Council of Rouen in 1072, has been collated and tabulated. One of the most exhaustive of these discussions, the report to the Lower House of the Convocation of York, the resolutions presented with which were adopted on June 14, 1896, is well known to you all.

That the difficulties of the question are as great as its pressing importance is apparent from the fact that, with precisely the same data on which to form an opinion, some of the most learned of our theologians, men with minds trained to weigh evidence, men of the devoutest spirit, have arrived at directly opposite conclusions, that, as a most conspicuous instance, the two friends Keble and Pusey take different sides. With regard to the perpetual obligation of the marriage bond, I suppose that the plain teaching of the Church in the Marriage Service, that it is indissoluble except by death would never have been questioned as the law of Christ, but for the doubtful and apparently corrupt text of St. Matt. xix. 9, and the various interpretations which ingenuity can put upon it. Separation would not have been construed into the annulling of the bond; divorce *a thoro et mensa* would not have been extended to divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*.

The other great controversy as to the prohibited affinities is also chiefly due to the English rendering of the obscure passage Lev. xviii. 18. The weight of Hebrew explanation seems to be against the exception claimed to be therein permitted and to indicate the finality of our Lord's declaration that, by marriage, man and wife become no longer twain but one flesh, so that the

blood relations of the one are henceforth the blood relations of the other.

It is the alarming and increasing frequency of marriages contracted by divorced persons during the life of the other party, and between a man and his deceased wife's sister, which calls for some authoritative pronouncement from the rulers of the Church, and some direct instruction for the government of the clergy.

In essaying such a duty, we are of course confronted with the difficulty that the civil law undertakes to legislate on these matters and to legislate not only in independence, but in violation of the law of the Church. It does not, it is true, oblige a priest to act in disobedience to the Church. No clergyman is compelled by the presentment of a license to marry a divorced person, or a widower to his sister-in-law; but so long as such unions have legal sanction, the clergy refusing to be parties to them are in a position of great difficulty; and as the unions will take place notwithstanding, nothing will be effected towards the abatement of the evil. The duty of the Church is undoubtedly to endeavor to bring some pressure upon the conscience of our national legislatures to restrain the wholesale licensing of acts that are contrary to the laws of God and of morality, though it is not probable that any protest would be effectual that was not supported by the strong concurrence of the whole Christian sense of the land.

I conceive that I may best serve the object for which this Conference is invited, by reciting the steps which have been taken to meet the evils of divorce and unlawful marriage by the Church in Canada, and explaining the present state of the law in that country on these two matters.

The first action taken in this direction by the Provincial Synod of Canada (which it may be explained comprises the Civil Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island) was called forth by the proposal in the Dominion Parliament of an Act legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister.

This was at the session of 1880. The House of Bishops sent down to the Lower House a Canon adopting the Table of Degrees prohibiting certain marriages set forth by authority in 1563 and providing "No Clergyman of this Ecclesiastical Province shall knowingly solemnize a marriage within the degrees prohibited by such a table."

This Canon was adopted by the Synod, and re-enacted twelve years afterwards. It was last year extended to apply to the whole Church of England in the Dominion of Canada, on being passed at the third session of the General Synod as Canon III. It is the only enactment on the subjects under consideration that appears on our Ecclesiastical Statute Books.

Notwithstanding petitions to both Houses of the Legislature presented from the Provincial Synod and most of the dioceses and

bishops, and further steps taken by a committee specially appointed for the purpose, to resist such legislation, the bill to legalize marriage with a deceased wife's sister was passed and assented to in May, 1882, and remains the law of the land.

The case of the marriage of divorced persons has proved more difficult to deal with. In 1889 a Canon was submitted to the Provincial Synod, that "No Clergyman of this Ecclesiastical Province shall solemnize marriage in any case where there is a divorced wife or husband of either party still living."

An amendment was proposed, "Provided always that this shall not extend or apply to the innocent party in any divorce suit, when a divorce *a vinculo matrimonii* is decreed."

After a long discussion this amendment was withdrawn, and the whole question of marriage and divorce referred to a joint committee to report at the next session in 1892.

The report presented accordingly was drawn up by the Bishop of Fredericton, the Chairman of the Committee, and was a most valuable contribution to the literature of the subject, its conclusions being presented in the following order:

I. The authority of the Holy Scriptures.

II. The Canon Law of England.

III. The Canon Law of other Churches.

(a) In communion with this Church.

(b) Not in communion with the Church of England.

IV. The opinions of the Fathers of the Church.

V. The opinion of the Lambeth Conference.

The Canon accompanying the report added to the previously proposed clauses, (1) forbidding Holy Communion (unless at the point of death) to a person marrying after divorce for any other cause than adultery (except an antecedent impediment nullifying the marriage contract), and (2) to a person divorced for adultery and marrying again, contrary to this Canon, during the lifetime of the other party; and (3) allowing Holy Communion to the so-called innocent party, with the express sanction of the bishop.

A minority report was presented by Archdeacon Roe of Quebec, justifying the remarriage of the innocent party, accompanied with a pamphlet exhaustively discussing the testimony of the Fathers and Councils of the Church and relying upon the distinction between fornication and adultery in our Lord's pronouncement.

The consideration of the report was postponed to the next session of the Synod in 1895, when it was referred to the General Synod meeting in the following year.

That body referred both Report and Minority Report to the Committee on Doctrine and Discipline. Meanwhile the House of Bishops resolved to send the questions to the Archbishop of Canterbury, with a request that they might be referred to a Committee of the Lambeth Conference to be held in the next year, and that they might receive an answer from the said con-

ference. As you are aware, the Lambeth Conference of 1897 did not deal with this subject.

In the Provincial Synod of 1898, the House of Bishops adopted a resolution, "That the marriage of a divorced person during the life of the other party is entirely to be deprecated, and that the clergy of this province should not perform such a marriage." I believe that my Right Reverend Brethren in Canada regard this resolution as I do, as still regulating the action of our clergy on this subject.

Here the matter rests at present. Considerable discussion, with resolutions and amendments, at the last Synod of 1901 resulted in reference to the impending General Synod. At that Synod, in 1902, all resolutions on the subject were lost.

The briefest statement of the Civil Law of Canada with regard to divorce will be sufficient.

In the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia, divorce courts are established. For the rest of the Dominion, divorce cases are adjudged upon by the Senate and an Act of Parliament passed for the relief of each successful suitor. The Act is of stereotyped form, and, after the preamble, consists of two short clauses, the first annulling the marriage, the second giving the right to the suitor to marry again, as though the first marriage had not taken place. The grounds for divorce are adultery and impotence alone (of course sometimes coupled with desertion or cruelty) in Canada; consanguinity being added in the Maritime Provinces.

Divorces granted to Canadians in the United States who have gone there for that purpose are void, and parties entering into fresh unions on the strength of them will be prosecuted for bigamy.

The number of divorces granted in twenty-one years, from 1867 to 1888 was:

Ontario and Quebec	26
New Brunswick	42
Nova Scotia	52
Prince Edward Island	2
British Columbia	15

During the last twelve years the number of Acts obtained from the Dominion Parliament was forty-two, or an average of three and one-half divorces per annum; in twenty-seven cases the husband being the suitor, and in fifteen the wife.

The small number of divorces thus obtained in Canada must be explained by the restriction of the ground allowed to proved adultery and by the almost prohibitive cost of the proceedings, \$1200.

There is no means of estimating the number of Canadians who go across the border to obtain an easy and cheap release from their matrimonial bonds.

It is the earnest desire of the Church in Canada that her sister

in the United States may be able to find some remedy whereby to check the ungodly system which is wrecking the happiness of so many Canadian homes.

But if anything is to be attempted by us of a practical nature, to safeguard the integrity of the Christian home from the increasing peril of divorce, I submit that we should begin with the root of the evil—hasty and ill-considered alliances repented of at leisure, marriages contracted from lower and baser motives—and be more plain-spoken, more instant, in instructing our people in the meaning and nature of this bond—that it is Holy Matrimony, not to be enterprised, nor taken in hand unadvisedly, lightly, or wantonly, to satisfy men's carnal lusts and appetites, like brute beasts, but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God, duly considering the causes for which it was ordained.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON.

Seventh Topic.

THE OBLIGATION OF THE CHURCH TO MAINTAIN THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY IN ITS INTEGRITY.

(b) THE DISCHARGE OF THE PARENTAL OBLIGATION.

First Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. DANIEL SYLVESTER TUTTLE, D.D., LL.D.,

BISHOP OF MISSOURI.

Scrutiny of human life discloses the three great institutions set by Almighty God to guide and help man; the Family, the State, the Church. All three are of divine appointment. The Family appears first in the gray dawn of the world's morning, at the outset of human history. No less can be said than that it is the unit of the human race, and under God, the source of human life and the warrant for human authority and law. In the beginning the State and the Church existed in it in embryo. The State, that is Civil Government, was at first patriarchal, if theocratic, and ever since potencies and prerogatives of the patriarchal permeated it, whatever its forms of theocracy, monarchy, oligarchy, or democracy. In the beginning also, the Church, that is the institution dealing with spiritual truth and religious duty, was patriarchal, and in the two forms into which it has since been transmuted, or rather developed and enlarged, the Jewish and the Christian, it has retained much of the patriarchal element, bespeaking the rock whence it was hewn and the hole of the pit whence it was digged.

One must expect the interrelations of the three divine institu-

tions to be close and deep. It is no traveling out of limits for the Church to be called upon to stand by the family, and the family, the Church. There is obligation resting on the Church to do its part in helping to maintain the integrity of the Christian family, and there is equal obligation on the heads of the family to feel and act and live by their sense of the responsibility of parental authority.

If there be two corner stones to the integrity of the family, and conjugal fidelity be the first one, certainly parental authority is the second. Abdication of that authority entails serious and sad results. Phaëthon got hold of the reins of his father Phœbus to drive the chariot of the sun for one day. He would have whelmed earth and sun and universe in one chaos of ruin, had not Jupiter shot him dead with a quick thunderbolt. Many are the Phaëthons of modern life, and not confined to the one sex either, who take the reins of authority out from the hands of ignorant or weak or overworked or unthoughtful or unfaithful parents; and collisions and catastrophes ensue, though, unlike those in the fable, too sadly true and real. It is to be feared that the United States, more than any other civilized nation, presents instances of such lamentable usurpation.

Eli was faithful as a prophet and upright as a judge, zealous, devout, godly, but Hophni and Phineas, his sons, were unworthy, selfish, insolent young men, though priests. The Lord God Jehovah called him accountable for their unworthiness, and to him the solemn, divine reproof and the incurred penalty were promised. The visiting of the sins of the fathers upon the children is proclaimed in one of the Ten Commandments. The visiting of the sins of the children upon the fathers was embodied in Jewish institutions, and confirmed in the Christian Church. St. Paul says expressly that the bishop or elder must be "one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity." And one "having faithful children who are not accused of riot, or unruly." And of deacons, too, he says, they must be those "ruling their children and their houses well." So abdication of parental authority was to be accounted not merely a weakness to be lamented, but also a fault to be punished. Into the home and out from the home flow pre-eminently the sweet and strong things of human life. If the sweetness is engendered of conjugal and parental love, the strength is largely supplied by parental authority. When the latter is wanting the home is undermined and subverted, and forces intended to be trained for the good of society grow to be its destructive foes. Family discipline need not work the suppression of individuality. There is no call for that, but it may guide and mold youthful energies along the line of help and not of hurt in an existence where helping and hurting are engaged in active and unceasing conflict. The sense of personal responsibility is a very prop and staff of society. Parental authority, so far from deadening or weaken-

ing that sense, can almost call it into being and can best promote its growth. The power of love, the sacredness of marriage, the restraining guidance of authority make the family to be, under God's providence, the great and wholesome influence for evoking best and noblest things out from the dust and din of human life. The Christian family pre-eminently have this well-forged and fitted triple armor of protection, love and marriage, and authority. Perhaps it was a polygamous family, dividing and shattering parental authority, which set the child into a rebellion unto death against the father, and called out that plaint of woe from the depths of a royal heart, "Would God that I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son."

It needs no deep study to discover how the welfare of the State depends on the exercise of parental authority. In history the family is the first divine institution; and patriarchal authority on theocratic warrant is the first form of civil government.

At times philosophers have tried to teach that man by nature is made solitary; that there was a time when there was no society, but men were in a state of nature. Then they came voluntarily together and by contract they constituted society; and under this social contact they each renounced a portion of their individual rights, as the price to society for the securing of the others. But with us of the present, theories do not count. Facts are demanded. Who in running back the history of any nation has ever found it resolving itself into a state of nature consisting of an aggregate of individual, disconnected units, exercising original independent personal rights? There are always found, last, first, and all the time, parental authority, tribal chieftainship, religious order. So there is fairness, there is wisdom, and there is weight in the Church Catechism when it puts the Fifth Commandment to be the ground of civil authority and indeed of all authority. "Love, honor and succor thy father and mother." There is home love, home peace, home duty, home reward. "Honor and obey the civil authority." There is good citizenship. "Submit thyself to all thy governors, teachers, spiritual pastors, and masters." There is the whole oneness of discipleship and discipline. "Order thyself lowly and reverently to all thy betters." There are good manners; and good manners and good morals are sisterly things. Order is Heaven's first law. It may well be earth's greatest need. There is a rightful exercise of authority by one man over another and a rightful subordination of one man to another in the field of that rightful exercise. "The powers that be are ordained of God." Divine sanction inheres in civil government. Liberty is a glorious word—the liberty wherewith Christ makes us free in the covenant of purchased redemption, and the grace of abounding love. Equality falls on the ear with a satisfaction that is world-wide. Equality before God who is "no respecter of persons," but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh His

righteousness is accepted with Him." Fraternity lifts the mind to praise and warms the heart with joy in the Incarnation: that gospel of blessed brotherhood which, recurring unceasingly, grows not old in the repeating. These are precious names, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, but wrenched from their divine attachment, transmuted into license and vanity, they were fuel flung on the fierce fires of irresponsible savagery in the French Revolution. Civil government involves subordination. Subordination is righteous, wholesome, conducive to the world's welfare.

It is evident, therefore, how vast is the good which the active and faithful use of parental authority may outwork for the State. Not simply in inculcating subordination and external obedience to precept, though these are worth a great deal, but also in training the young to habits of self-restraint, self-discipline, and personal responsibility—and these are worth far more. The attitude of respect for authority and reverence for those rightfully wielding it assumed and practiced in the home, of inestimable value in the civic community as a real force for preventing wrong and insuring justice, loyalty, and patriotism as living influences is an outgrowth from the family. As dynamic forces they are focused in the home. Focus, anyway, however the Latin of it be Englished, is the heart's place. Service and sacrifice *pro patria* are real service and sacrifice *pro focis et aris*. Without service and sacrifice the State cannot endure. By service and sacrifice the home exists. The eminent teachers and exemplars of both therein are the mothers. Yet for them the depth of devotion does not mean narrowness. We ourselves have known mothers, really Spartan, who in earnestness of meaning, if not in classic phrase, have sent forth sons to serve the country with the heroic command "With your shields or upon them." In these later days, said to be glaringly selfish and corruptingly licentious, an illustrious instance of a wife's affectionate steadfastness and a mother's untiring devotion has been presented in the life and history of that sovereign lady, Queen Victoria. Though great and wise in rulership, the splendor of the crown paled before the luster of her simple homely Christian virtues. Hence the influence she wielded and the meed of loving reverence which she wore were not limited by national and racial lines. Love, duty, service, and sacrifice stood four-square for her to all the winds that blow. In all the bounds of civilization there was not a heart that did not bow to her in grateful, affectionate respect; and her wonderful life demonstrated what a vast work of beneficence the home can do for the State, and, indeed, for the world.

As for the Church, the intimate relationship between her and the family is readily apparent. One need not go back to patriarchal times to see it. For foundation work the Church of the Prayer Book goes straight into the family and there lodges influences and there concentrates forces. Beginning with infant

baptism, laying that foundation and building on it, the theological shaping of religious truth and the wholesome provision of spiritual nourishment become quite different things to the Church of the Prayer Book from what they are to the various Christian bodies who do not have the Prayer Book. Individuality, subjectivity, feelings, need not be ruled out. Yet certainly they need not be ruled in to be made rulers over man's whole being. They are valuable forces, if kept steady as planets to their own orbits. They are disturbing forces, and once again injurious, if left to shoot aside and stray like comets. Personal repentance, personal faith, personal outreaching and upreaching, are good things, blessings to the individual. But before them, in order of time and in count of importance, are the corporate, social things of covenant adoption and covenant grace and covenant fellowship and covenant duty and privilege. The divine power of involution has placed these good things in infant baptism. Evolution by and through the Holy Spirit shall disclose their existence and, happily, their benefit to all patient, faithful souls. The concentrated essence of Church doctrine and Bible truth is in infant baptism. It is the recording gospel of a covenant. And in the covenant are the loving adoption by God the Incarnate Son, and impartation of grace by God the Holy Ghost, the Giver of life. Infant baptism is signal proof that in the field of spiritual truth and religious duty God's things are the great things and man's things are the little things. Man's repentance, man's faith, man's obedience, man's holiness; these be important things, but they shrink into littleness compared with God's covenant, God's adoption, God's love, God's grace. It is not man's choosing of God to be his Father and the witnessing of that choice by his fellow men,—that is the important part of Holy Baptism,—but rather God's choosing of man to be the child of his spiritual adoption. Parental love should hail with joy and gratitude the great blessing which God is ready to give their child in Baptism. Parental reason should recognize that as their child is born into membership in the family and citizenship in the state, after the same fashion he should be born, or re-born, into membership in God's spiritual Kingdom the Church. And parental authority should see to it that the divine benefit and benedictions be not withheld from their child by any failure in bringing him to receive them.

No wonder that the Church enjoins in her rubrics that "The minister of every parish shall often admonish the people [it is evident that the parents are particularly meant] that they defer not the baptism of their children longer than the first or second Sunday next after their birth, or other holy day falling between, unless upon a great and reasonable cause." And no wonder that the Church in the United States, while no doubt appreciating the excellence and value of an ancient institution of sponsors, has preferred to emphasize parental duty and parental authority by

providing that "Parents shall be admitted as sponsors if it be desired."

Yet the blessings of the covenant are not of the *ex opere operato* sort. If God's benefits conferred upon loved children are to be effectively applied and used, they call for co-operation on the part of His loving children, and it is the duty of sponsors to set the children along the path and keep them in the way of such co-operation. Sponsors are the representatives of parents, the supplementaries of parents, hence the duty of sponsors is parental authority. That authority is engaged and enjoined to see to it that the child be instructed "in all things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health"; and that he be "virtuously brought up to lead a godly and a Christian life." There is included an old-fashioned injunction withal—that he be called upon "to hear sermons."

Is it too much to say that right here there is noted, at least to us of the Church, an abdication of parental authority greatly to be regretted? We fear that children are not taught the Catechism and the Bible in the home to the same extent as fifty years ago. It may be said that Sunday Schools are annexes to homes, and may take upon themselves this portion of parental duty. They may, but even if they do, no Sunday-school teacher, of whatever imaginable excellence, can lodge instructive thoughts in the child's mind or deepen godly impressions in the child's heart as can the father or mother. As for calling upon him to hear sermons, the injunction is made to furnish ground for forms of witty speech quite as often as it is taken seriously to indicate a wholesome and important duty. Take the term not in its narrow solitariness of meaning, but in its fruitful connections and relations. Granted that the child hears sermons best in the examples of daily life of its father and mother; granted also that the private prayers whispered at the mother's knee at the bedside, and said by the father's side in the family devotions, are sermons than which none can be better; and granted, too, that the hearing of sermons by the crude young mind as reasoning adapted to the intellect, or as exhortations urged upon the sense of duty, is a thing of vain inappropriateness, yet he that hath an ear to receive it knows that the injunction "to hear sermons" carries with it the injunction to go to church, to honor and obey and worship Almighty God. Of little children in the family pew, of the worshipping congregation is there not a sad deficiency nowadays? "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Is that not a command to the children as well as others? And how can the Lord's Day be kept holy save by gatherings thereon in the congregation for worship of His Holy Name? Our blessed heritage in the Book of Common Prayer should teach us that in the normal worshipping congregation the little children should be included. It is prayer and praise common to them with us. They can say "Our Father" and "Amen" as well as we. They can

iterate "I believe in God the Father" as well as we. And if Sunday Schools have worked this displacement and disappearance of the children from the worshipping congregation, it is one bad result of theirs to be set over against their many good ones. There need be no resort to compulsion. Compulsion is justly criticised. By reason of its unwholesome reaction it may be denounced. But if parental authority would use its power in bringing the children to church in no different way from the use of it in sending them to school or gathering them for protection and sleep night after night in the house, it could form and foster in them the invaluable habit of going to church, not only an obedience unto God, but also a wholesome restraint against evil and a nourishing support of good and a comforting refreshment of spirit for all their earthly years. St. Paul speaks once again of "The Church in the house." The words declare a close and intimate relation. Conversely, sweetness, security, and strength all around will attend upon the presence of the family in the church. And church and home can co-work in teaching God's truth and in learning God's laws and in obeying God's will. "These words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house and on thy gates."

The Church, so far as her formalities are concerned, cannot be charged with neglect of her obligation to urge the responsibility of parental authority. Witness the address to sponsors, and in them, and through them to parents: "Ye are to take care that this child be brought to the bishop to be confirmed by him so soon as he can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and is sufficiently instructed in other parts of the Church Catechism set forth for that purpose." Witness also the rubric at the end of the Catechism: "All fathers and mothers shall cause their children who have not learned their Catechism to come to the church at the time appointed, and obediently to hear and to be ordered by the minister until such time as they have learned all that is here appointed for them to learn." Directions and injunctions of the Church are not wanting. If there be lack it is the heedful and loving practice of the Church people that is wanting. Compulsion must not be used in bringing children to Confirmation. Let there be a stopping short of that. That would mean harm to the individual soul, and would bring sad violence of after reaction. But the quiet, loving, steady exercise of parental authority should be used. So, in popular thought, Confirmation might get its true, full meaning. It is not merely the opportunity for the individual soul to come for-

ward to renew its baptismal vows. It is that,—and a valuable opportunity it is voluntarily to enlist in the Saviour's service, and to put on His full uniform, and to take the sacramental oath of personal allegiance in the Church militant. But it is more. It is another step into the inner circle of grace; a further receiving of the benefits and blessings of the spiritual covenant. What God gives in it, not what man does in it, is the great thing. Holy Baptism may be esteemed the sacrament of covenant adoption by God the Father, and Holy Communion the sacrament of covenant brotherhood in God the Incarnate Son, and Confirmation the complement of the one sacrament and preparation for the other, as the sacramental covenant gift of God the Holy Ghost. How could the laying-on-of-hands get its rating as one of the principles of the doctrine of Christ, with repentance and faith, and baptism and the resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment, except it were the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace of the gift of the Holy Ghost? And parental love, alive to the covenant blessings promised to its dear ones, should combine with parental authority to bring the children to receive those blessings from God through the Church.

The combination of parental love and parental authority makes a unity of power indeed. If into this combination there be bound the sanctities of the marriage bond preserved inviolate, and reverence for the home life kept deep and true, family prayer sent up daily as the sweet savor of an incense, there would ensue teaching of unspeakable value by "precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little and there a little" to make strong the best of human agencies for maintaining the integrity of the Family, the stability of the State, and the vitality of the Church.

Yet, evermore, example is better than precept. Example is helped on by a characteristic of human nature; that is, the strong force of imitation, strongest in children. Precept is hindered by a strong force of human nature; that is, an uprising of dislike and resistance to be enjoined, positive law. Others than children know quite naturally this force. If the one has a natural force mightily efficient to help it, and the other a natural force mightily efficient to hinder it, who wonders that it is said, and found out, and known that example is better and stronger than precept?

If parents will add example to precept, or, better still, will add precept to example, they shall weave a double cord of enduring strength to draw with it promotion of the glory of God, the best welfare of men, and the happiness of their own and their children's souls.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON.

*Seventh Topic.*THE OBLIGATION OF THE CHURCH TO MAINTAIN THE
CHRISTIAN FAMILY IN ITS INTEGRITY.

(b) THE DISCHARGE OF THE PARENTAL OBLIGATION.

Second Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. MAURICE S. BALDWIN, D.D.,
BISHOP OF HURON.

It is a true remark, and one which has great force and beauty in it, that all our ideas of home are gathered from Him who, when He was fulfilling His ministry on earth had no home, who said of Himself that while foxes had holes and birds of the air their nests, the Son of man had not where to lay His head. Yet, what institution is there in the Christian community with boughs so spreading, with roofs so deep, with loveliness so surpassing fair as that blessed sanctuary which we call home?

Two great institutions there are with which we Christians are all intimately connected, and in whose welfare all our interests are more less involved. I refer first to *Home* and secondly to the *State*. It is deeply interesting to observe the remarkable sanction which our Lord has given to them both.

Our Redeemer is recorded to have wept only twice in His brief sojourn upon earth: once over Martha and Mary at the grave of Lazarus; the second time, over Jerusalem when she rejected Him, and the profound and consolatory inference has been drawn by a late eminent writer, that our Lord had the deepest and most loving sympathy with these two above-mentioned institutions, the Home and the State.

To both He gave the most touching evidence of His love and sympathy, namely, His tears.

Whatever, therefore, to-day may be said against either of them; however faulty in their construction, our Lord does not seek to destroy them, to write bitter things against them, but to reform and regenerate them, to make them what they should be in the light and power of His presence. I doubt not that even now, throned though He be in the splendor of His inaccessible light, among the many sad things which grieve and sadden Him on the earth must be the condition of the State on the one hand, and of the Home on the other. This strong consolation, therefore, we have that however difficult, however apparently hopeless the task we now have before us of making these institutions instinct with new life and power, we have the strong sympathy and love of the

Lord Jesus Christ with us; the availing sympathy of Him who shed His scalding tears over them both.

In the solution of this great question, how best to subordinate the home to the influence and authority of the truth, we do well to consider what is God's unchanging plan in the regulation of the universe itself. He places the sun in the midst, and compels every planet in the system to revolve throughout all time about it. By this inscrutable law no orb in the heavens ever collides with, or endangers the safety of another; all keep their proper distance, and act in perfect harmony. Our gigantic universe itself is said to revolve round some other distant and awful center, so that in the material heavens all things created, whether great or small, are dominated by, and subordinated to, this one tremendous law. Thus God fixes by His unalterable decree a certain center, around which all secondary objects are bound absolutely to revolve.

One says: in ancient times they used to teach in the schools a system that was known as the Ptolemaic, which, giving as it did, a wrong center, proclaimed that this little earth, only a molecule compared to the giant worlds about it, was the absolute center of the whole universe. Now, it has been well said of this system that making the center wrong, the circumference and everything else within it had to be wrong also. We know better now. We know the minuteness of our earth. We know the magnitude of the lordly sun. We know that this center rules with majestic power the earth and every planet that comes within the reach of its bewildering attraction. It is so in the spiritual world: here Christ Jesus is the Sun of righteousness, the center of the moral universe, for it pleased the Father that in Him should all fullness dwell. In His exaltation, in making Him Lord over all, supreme and infinite head over all our homes lies the future and the glory of our hope. Now our Lord's plan is that the parents themselves shall be subordinated in everything to Himself, and be the true guides and instructors of their children. They are to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. The present laxity and want of discipline which constitute so painful a characteristic of our age invert the Divine order and actually, in many instances, subordinate the parents to the children. The results of this frightful inversion of the divine order are everywhere evident in the distressing shipwrecks we are compelled to witness every day.

The "burthensome times" spoken of by St. Paul in his second epistle to Timothy are now fully upon us, the characteristic of which are that men shall be lovers of their own selves, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy. Now, the only way to bring order out of chaos, and symmetry out of confusion, is to exalt the living and glorious Christ, and so to uplift and magnify Him through the Holy Ghost that parents may be led to assume and maintain their own God-given position as the guides and teachers of their own families.

I say not this from any economic or earthly standpoint, but as being an essential part of God's great revelation to man; obedience to which is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost; disobedience, inevitable death.

As a humble contribution toward this most desirable end, I would submit the following considerations, all of far more importance than they usually receive:

First, The development of the Sunday school in the activities of the Church.

A modern writer says: "Whatever you wish a nation to know, put it into the minds of her young." Now if there is a subject which demands pre-eminent attention, and calls for immediate action on the part of all those who love their God or country, it is the question how can the Church best educate and train up the world of the young, growing into manhood and womanhood all about her? Attention has been drawn to the enormous claims which some modern writers have made for civilization as a refining, transforming power; indeed they have had the boldness and audacity to assert that civilization can effect that which the Gospel is unable to produce, and that, therefore, it ought to precede it, as better suited in their judgment for the wants and miseries of barbaric and savage nations. In reply to this the Holy Scriptures, and the practical experience of centuries of time, answer, No. Teaching without the hallowing, restraining influence of the blessed religion of our Lord is more likely to destroy than to build up a character, to ruin rather than to bless.

No, we need a definite course of religious instruction throughout all our schools and halls of learning, whether this idea be in harmony with political wisdom or not. There are thousands who apparently neither teach their children at home, nor send them to the Sunday schools of the Church. If therefore no religious instruction be given to these children, either at home or abroad, what guarantee have we that they will not grow up as a brood of infidels or outcasts from the faith? The Bible in the school we ought to have, and must have, if we are going to save the growing generation from the abyss of an awful and paralyzing infidelity.

We learn this from the undeniable fact that of the men who are living abandoned lives by far the worst, the hardest to reclaim, are those who come from our universities and highest schools of learning. A modern speaker, commenting upon this subject, says: "This was the great lesson which England had to learn in the great mutiny in India in A. D. 1857, when the man who perpetrated the massacre of Cawnpore, and broke all faith and covenant, was one who had received England's learning without England's faith in God. His mind had been enlarged, his capacities quickened by all the learning of the secular schools, but grace had never taught him to control his passions or subordinate his mind to the holy will of God, so that instead of being an example of what God could make him by grace, his education only left him a

savage still—a tiger that sprang from its lair to deeds of atrocity and blood.” I have often been struck by the masterful way in which Rome grasps this tremendous subject; whatever she omits, she never neglects this. She says to herself, she *must* have, and will have, the whole education of her young in her own imperious hands. Whatever is necessary, in her judgment, for the spiritual welfare of young; whatever great principles of her Church are to be impressed upon their minds, Rome insists shall be taught them at her own knee, and she, and no one else, shall lay the foundations of their future faith. How often in our streets do we see long processions of boys and girls of their communion, but never without their attending priests and guardians to watch over them every moment of the day. The sleepless eye of Rome is over them every hour of their childhood, and never will she let them slip from her hands until she feels sure that her name is so interwoven with the cords and fibers of their nature that, in her judgment, no storms or trials can ever erase it from their hearts.

Now, how do we too often act in bringing up the young committed to our care? In many instances we leave them absolutely to themselves unarmed, unprepared, untaught to be molded and indurated, like the canyons of the West, into a thousand grotesque and vicious forms by the rude action of the times we live in. I would say: Let the Church cast off the apathy and indifference of the past, and awaken to a new life of zeal and action, exercising, by the grace of God, her undoubted right to be both the guardian and teacher of her wandering and helpless young.

Here in the school with the youth of the land at her feet, and with the words of the Lord Jesus in her mouth, she can proclaim truths which, through the Holy Ghost, may re-create their lives, renew their dispositions, and make their home what it really should be—a Heaven on earth, an oasis in the desert—an Elim of palms and fountains amid the waterless districts of a weary and sinful earth.

How imperative therefore is the necessity that the Church should seize this golden opportunity of youth and endeavor by the grace of God to stamp upon it that glorious name which is above every other name, the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Secondly. For the strengthening the parental authority I would strongly recommend that the Church impress upon her people the sacredness and absolutely binding character of the marriage vow.

I can hardly imagine any evil more likely to unhinge and utterly dislocate the foundations of home and of society itself, than loose and unscriptural ideas about the holiness of that marriage which was instituted by God Himself in the Garden of Eden and now solemnized by the Church with all the sanctions of the Christian religion. There is one great truth which all branches of the Catholic Church must agree in teaching—that it is a most solemn vow and covenant not to be enterprised, nor taken in hand, unadvisedly, lightly, or wantonly, but reverently, discreetly, ad-

visedly, soberly, and in the fear of God, duly considering the causes for which matrimony was ordained. Surely, too, all branches of the Church should unite in indorsing this: "Those whom God hath joined together let not man put asunder." The supposed disruption of the marriage tie, and the loose and utterly unscriptural ideas so often prevalent in society on this momentous subject, now constitute an awful factor in the destruction of home and the overthrow of all those sweet relationships of family life which gladden our path and help us, under God, to endure the burdens and bear the sorrows of this stormy, troubled world. It is stated that the Home is the great unit of society, and of the State itself, and therefore if we break up the one we must also of necessity break up the other, for the two are indissolubly linked together, and the fall of the one must in the end inevitably produce the fall of the other.

I think therefore for the glory of God and the advancement of His truth, for the preservation of our homes and the saving of our young, the Church is bound to make to the world about her a bold and clear statement on this all-important subject; she is bound to maintain the teaching of her Lord and to build up her position by the verities of the word of truth.

Thirdly. The lowering the dignity and estimation of the Bible in the eyes of the people through a false and destructive criticism constitutes one of the most awful factors of the day for the overthrow of the home and all that is good and holy in this land.

When I speak of the dignity of the Bible as being lowered by a false and destructive criticism, I only mean that it is so in the eyes of the world at large; the Bible itself cannot be injured by all the infidelity and rationalism of the age, and will come out of all the fierce attacks of its enemies like Shadrach, Meshech, and Abednego from the furnace of Nebuchadnezzar without even the smell of fire resting upon it. We need have no fear as to the stability of the Bible: it will stand through all the vicissitudes of time, and will be vindicated at last, sentence by sentence, and word by word, in the all-searching light of eternity itself.

"Forever changeless, and the same forever." The Lord Jesus Christ honored the Scriptures. He said: "In the volume of the Book it is written of Me." It has been well said that in this Holy Bible He found the exact path His hallowed feet were to tread from the manger-cradle in Bethlehem to the Cross of Calvary and on thence to the heights of glory. When tempted or assailed either by friends or foes to turn aside, even for a moment, from His inflexible purpose, His invariable answer was: How, then, can the Scriptures be fulfilled? The Holy Scriptures were the guide and index of all His days—the solemn, inscrutable limit beyond which it was impossible even for Him to pass.

When, therefore, we contrast this awful and divine dignity with which our Lord ever invested the Holy Scriptures with the haughty, impudent, blasphemous writings of the so-called school

of destructive criticism, we cannot but be amazed at the bold audacity and wickedness of professing Christian men. Undeterred by the solemn statement of our Lord, "That on whomsoever this Stone should fall it would grind him to powder," they challenge His word, deny His miracles, and contradict Him to His face. What the Lord Jesus Christ honors, the Church must honor. What He calls holy, she must call holy too. We know our blessed Lord believed in the absolute accuracy and truthfulness of the written word, and therefore the Church has no room for doubt. She should take her place forever at His side.

Hostile criticism has already done an awful and shameless work for which it will have to answer at the bar of God. It has strengthened the cold forbidding heart of skepticism and infidelity, cheered on the roystering drunkard at his cups, and taught untold ecstatic youths, as they are pressing forward to receive holy orders, that it is a sign of genius to question, and of manliness to deny, the very foundations of our common faith.

And what, I may ask, can break up the blessed ties of home with greater rapidity than the loosening of all faith in the inspired word of God? Surely the family is bound together by other ties than those of consanguinity and affection; under all the blessedness of home lies a common faith in the Fatherhood of God, the salvation wrought out by our Lord and Saviour, and the certainty of those promises more immutable than the everlasting hills.

Therefore, if we desire to maintain the sanctity of our home, by all means let us hold fast the faith once delivered to the saints.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON.

Eighth Topic.

THE ADAPTATION OF THE CHURCH'S METHOD'S TO THE NEEDS OF THE CENTURY.

(b) TO MEET RELIGIOUS DIFFICULTIES.—OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY AND FAMILY WORSHIP.

First Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM WOODRUFF NILES, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.,
BISHOP OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Abashed I am, my Right Reverend Brethren, to find myself addressing you upon a subject like this, of "Family Worship,"—a subject upon which I most certainly can set forth nothing not already known by you, every one, as well as by me. And of the

importance of the thing itself you are as well persuaded, doubtless, as I can possibly be. Yet I find myself set to this task; and all one can do is to accept the command and take up the duty.

If there were before me a congregation of lay folk, with a stout heart and with feelings very solemn, as God's minister and prophet, I could address myself to them. For a man who has accepted the responsibilities which a family brings, few things more belong to his peace, few things along with a steady, pure, consistent life on his part, more help in the bringing of his children forward in Christian living, than this daily kneeling together under the home roof; and looking up to the Heavenly Father in supplication, and with words of thanksgiving and praise, in faith and love. Then, indeed, if the heart be pure, they can believe in a Divine guidance through the day. Then they have the right to feel that there is a roof over their heads at night. "Whoso dwelleth under the defense of the Most High, shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty."

The young man growing up in an atmosphere charged with faith in God and in things not seen is very apt to believe in spiritual verities when he shall have come to man's estate, and apt to "endure as seeing Him who is invisible." To bring men and women to believe in spiritual verities, to believe with the Imagination as with the mind, so that those verities shall be to the soul and mind just as real as the ground on which they tread,—in a word, to bring the Invisible God and the things above to be visible to the mortal man, this is a large part of the Christian minister's work. He who has grown up in nearness to heavenly things, in sacrament, and in public worship, and in private prayer, and in the daily communion of the family at their common worship, is least likely to find those realities fade in later years. And surely in an age like this, with its rush and its noise, with material things pressing upon us on every side, we ought to let slip no help to forming in us the spiritual mind.

Moreover, inasmuch as prayers said in and by a family include much of petition and of giving of thanks for the family, and for common things connected with their life in common, all this tends very helpfully to the right way of looking at our ordinary work and at our every-day affairs—at what we are too ready to deem only secular. Surely the right way, and the only Christian way, of esteeming all these honest, necessary, common things, is as part of our religion, and not needing ever to war against the soul. That Christian has gained much who has learned how to be at once "not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." And the holy prophet long ago sang of these days of the Messiah: "In that day upon the bells of the horses shall be holiness to the Lord. And the pots in the Lord's House shall be as the bowls before the altar, yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be holiness to the Lord of Hosts."

Earthly joys and earthly cares, religiously lived in, are religious and pleasing to God—the kitchen, the workshop, the humblest task and service, every one. And St. Peter's spiritual priesthood of all believers finds its exercise and place. All which good things are largely furthered when the man, as priest in his own house, every day thanks God at the family meal, and invokes, in behalf of all in the house, God's blessing on their ordinary duties of the day.

These benefits all, and many others, come to the family from family worship by and through the act and the habit, apart from God's direct answers to the prayers.

If, then, it is nearness to God that tells; if a vivid faith, a holy love, a deep consciousness of Divine things,—in a word, if what we are counts more with God than our many activities, than the amount that we do, then surely all these quiet, old-fashioned, evangelical ways of a domestic piety ought to be firmly held, and kept, and honored.

To have made the daily drawing nigh to God in the devout practices of a Christian home manifestly a business, a serious business, not to be lightly put aside, will, under God, go far in determining the estimate which they who grow up in the atmosphere of such a home will through life put upon the things of God—of worship, of duty, of faith, of religion's transcendent place. For him it is easier,—I had almost said it is natural,—to make the Kingdom of God the First Thing.

Last week I was guest in a homestead in my own diocese, which house had been held by one family from the first, one hundred and twenty years. In all these years, so far as it is known or believed, not one day had passed without prayers to God going up from the assembled family beneath that roof. That family has spread itself out in many branches. Some of its descendants have attained much distinction and unto very great usefulness, as heads of universities, in civic affairs of moment and of large reach in large cities; in erecting and endowing churches; in establishing and nourishing institutions of mercy; in promoting missions both at home and in foreign lands; most of all, in the beautiful ways of a pure and gracious domestic life and of its homely duties. Best of all, among the scores of men and women who themselves or whose ancestors have gone forth from that homestead, not one poor life have I ever known, not one selfish or unworthy deed. None of the kindred folk has, so far as I know and believe, turned his back upon the faith and the practice of Christ's religion.

The multiform organizations and activities in the Church of to-day have their value, and a value not small. But better than church clubs, than guilds, and the rest,—more pleasing to Christ, I am sure, and a brighter beacon-light to this generation groping in mist,—are the God-fearing, godly families, in which an old-fashioned piety is still practiced, and the Heavenly Father is

openly recognized every day, and his Son our Redeemer, and the Life-giving Spirit.

Difficulties, and some of them grave, this twentieth century presents, and ugly obstacles to a satisfactory having of family worship. Partly the rush of modern life in general, and the complexity of that life is responsible, partly the railway train which takes away the head of the family at some exceedingly early hour. And much is most inconvenient. But none will be a well-grown or a useful Christian upon earth who does only what is "convenient." "The line of greatest resistance," not that of least resistance, is often that against which a brave man brings his forces. "Needless softness and self-indulgence" is just as poor a thing to-day as it was when John Wesley wrote his solid precepts. The man who will usually can have some measure of worship in his family. If twice each day be impossible, once is far better than nothing. If he cannot gather the household flock and be with them in the morning, perhaps he can do it in the evening; if the evening be impossible for him, he may do it in the morning. If the man must leave his home before children can be had for prayers, and returns too late at night, whether always or some days, then the mother should have the devotions, and thus both serve God and let the child see that to serve God is a vital matter, not to be lightly put to one side.

I remember to have taken up a book in England, five or six years ago, having the title "Some Lost Things in Religion." Prominent among these "things" stood "family worship." I think the book came from Scotland; yet one fears that some ground for the reproach can be found in England. It is to me a joy to bear witness that, while in England, I have been a guest in homes from that of high nobility to that of a tenant farmer, yet I was never in a home in which the family were not every morning brought together for their worship. It is a deep grief that I cannot bear such unvarying testimony concerning America.

I sometimes ask myself whether I, as their bishop, have as strongly as I ought to have done admonished my brethren, the pastors of the flock, to bring home this duty, in its large bearings and its unyielding obligation, upon all the people. Godless homes, semi-godless homes, will yield a generation of worthless citizens and of lost souls.

A bright young friend of mine, a communicant in the Church, educated at a Christian school and a Christian college, a very active man of business, speaking with me in Massachusetts recently, said that in his acquaintance family prayers were a thing unknown, and that with grace at meals the case was almost, but not quite, as bad.

On the other hand, some young lawyers and others in secular life whom I know, reared in families in which nothing was permitted to overturn the daily worship at home, in building their

beautiful houses were careful to have one convenient room constructed and set apart for the sole worship of the God of all the families in the land.

If not more is attempted than can be carried through, that helps matters. Not long ago I chanced to be staying with a justice of the supreme court of his State—a singularly able and brilliant man. Duties compelled him very often to go from home by an early train. It was not so early, however, as to forbid breakfast with the family. Those hurried days this was done: when gathered at the table a sentence of Scripture was said; then, all kneeling, the Lord's Prayer was used and one Collect, that for the day, or the Collect for Direction, and the Grace, or, the Benediction in the Office of the Visitation of the Sick, changed to form of a prayer: "Unto God's gracious mercy and protection we now commit ourselves."

Many books of prayers for use in the family are, like Bishop Coxe's "Covenant Prayers," arranged for each day, in groups of several prayers, one of which can be used, or two or three, but not necessarily all at any one time. Or, some book of prayers on the plan of Bishop Wainwright's "Short Prayers for Family Use," but rather better suited, perhaps, otherwise than this particular book, can be commended to those who make inquiries of their minister. Indeed the minister, one would think, might very well make it a point to speak to his families, one and another, of some book suited to each, or show them in general some course of worship suited to each individual household.

Whether much Scripture can be read or but little, whether a hymn can be sung, and all such details must adjust themselves to the conditions ruling under each roof. Neither the needs nor the temper of these times make long prayers desirable, especially when children have to be considered.

When and where the excellent ideal and rule of the Church can be reached of Daily Morning and Evening Prayer, and when the church is not far removed from the home of the family, is it right and best to let this service wholly take the place as a substitute of worship in the family? For myself, and no ways raising the question which is the greater, I do not think this a good and sufficient cause. In the offices of the Prayer Book, as these are had in church, a certain element of home is lacking, and ought to be. Then, almost always, members of the family cannot be all at church, and so must lose some part of their social worship if and whenever any day's worship at the home is omitted.

And it may be very justly questioned, I think, whether Sunday's services, though larger and higher far, be quite a substitute of such sort as to make it best on that day ordinarily to omit the family prayers.

"Where there's a will there's a way." If the purpose be a resolute one, almost every family can, even in these rushing days, find some way of lifting this worship of the family, as a family,

into a place of some dignity, much to the honoring of God, and to their own spiritual good.

Three families rise before me at this moment, all made up of members having deep piety, a very high character, and of much refinement of soul. In one, the head, a physician greatly beloved, to whom more than one large school owes its existence, a man much further advanced in years than I, came home from his early service in church, and took up his family prayers by the time that the guests and others of the family had gathered. In another home in the city of Boston, in everything one of the purest and best, it chanced one morning that those of the family who were not absent were so indisposed as to keep their room. When I came, unexpected and late, to the door of the library, this noble, high-bred Christian scholar and man was at the accustomed place, read his Bible, sang the hymn with his own accompaniment at the organ, and knelt in prayers in the family's name.

The other beautiful home on which my heart loves to dwell had it for the custom to have for the household, with such servants as could be present, very short prayers in the dining-room before breakfast. Then a little later in the morning (there was not daily service at church) the man and his wife, being persons of leisure, with any who could be free to join them, in some room a bit retired read the Psalter, and both lessons, with at least two or three of the prayers.

Of each of those three men everyone who knew him would bear witness that, beyond all question, he walked with God. And our people can be assured that if they plod on dutifully, in all pious ways, when they shall have finished their course and done their work, they shall be refreshed in the Paradise of God; shall rise in the Resurrection of the Blessed, and shall come all before the glorious throne on high, with one heart to adore the common Saviour of us all.

At the end, my brethren, this one suggestion I will offer: Might we not, perhaps, charge our clergy with some earnestness, of the value of this and all like acts of a humble, daily piety? For myself I mean to bear down more strongly than I have done in dealing with clergy and people upon this both helpful and blessed privilege, that through my small diocese "family worship" may not be one of the "Lost Things in Religion."

FRIDAY AFTERNOON.

*Eighth Topic.*THE ADAPTATION OF THE CHURCH'S METHODS TO
THE NEEDS OF THE CENTURY.(b) TO MEET RELIGIOUS DIFFICULTIES.—OBSERVANCE
OF THE LORD'S DAY AND FAMILY WORSHIP.*Second Paper.*

THE RIGHT REV. FREDERICK COURTNEY, D.D.,

BISHOP OF NOVA SCOTIA.

In order to state this subject so as to discuss it profitably, it is necessary, first, to set out what are the Church's methods for the observance of the Lord's Day. It will not, I suppose, be disputed that the Church's one method is to put forth services of divine worship and to invite the faithful to come together and join in them. They are, first, Morning Prayer, with the Litany; second, Holy Communion; third, Evening Prayer. There is also provision for a sermon to be preached in the second service. This method has by common consent been so far adapted to the needs of the present day as that the second service is frequently said first, without a sermon; the first service is said second, with a sermon; the Litany is said by itself at various times; and Evening Prayer is frequently shortened, but has a sermon added to it for which there is no provision in the Book of Common Prayer.

There is an enactment also in the Church in the United States of America that, "On any day when Morning and Evening Prayer shall have been said, or are to be said in Church, the minister may, at any other service for which no form is provided, use such devotions as he shall at his discretion select from this Book, subject to the direction of the Ordinary"; so that the method of that Church is to make provision for services in addition to those prescribed by the other Churches with which she is in Communion. In practice, the Church assembles the children in Sunday Schools, and the youth in Bible classes, and invites those who think themselves qualified to teach.

The Church's method has been to recite once every Sunday the Mosaic Decalogue, and in her Articles has asserted that "No Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral"; and this would appear to indicate that the Church holds the principle embodied in the Fourth Commandment to be applicable to the observance of the Lord's Day—seeing that, while she does not and never has observed the Sabbath, she recites its law and prays that our hearts

may be inclined to keep it, a practice which can be exempted from the charge of inconsistency, only by putting the Lord's Day in the Sabbath's place, and making the due observance of the former a sufficient reason for the non-observance of the latter. It follows, therefore, that the Church's method with regard to the observance of the Lord's Day is to recite to her people the Fourth Commandment, and to declare that "no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience" due to it.

The same conclusion may be reached in another way, viz., by asserting that the true definition of law is that it is the declaration of the duties arising out of right relationship, and therefore that the principles contained in what is called the "moral law" are as enduring as the relationship between God and man, and between man and his neighbor. And if this be admitted,—and I do not see how it can reasonably be denied,—it will necessarily follow that the principle involved in the Fourth Commandment is of perpetual obligation, whether the one day in seven be at the end or at the beginning of the week; and the sanction for the due observance of the one can be claimed for the due observance of the other, and it never can be right to cease yielding obedience to a law which prescribes a duty arising out of the relationship between God and man so long as both continue in such relationship. It has been pointed out that there are four reasons given in the Old Testament for the observance of the Sabbath: First, as a remembrance of creation (a reminder also of the requirement of six days' work as well as of the seventh day's rest): second, as a lesson of humanity—"that thy manservant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thee"; third, in commemoration of the deliverance from Egypt. "The Lord thy God brought thee out . . . therefore the Lord thy God hath commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day"; fourth, to be a sign between God and man. "Moreover, I gave them the Sabbath to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." It is claimed that all these are just as good for the observance of the Lord's Day, the third (the deliverance from Egypt) being only the historical prefigurement of the greater and more blessed deliverance of His people from the bondage to sin and Satan.

It might be argued, and reasonably so, that as our Lord, in speaking of the Sixth and Seventh Commandments, showed them to have a far deeper significance than had been attached to them before; and therefore, to be the more necessary to be observed, we should say the same regarding the Fourth; and, indeed, if what I have laid down above is admitted, and therefore it is seen that the moral law is not the declaration of the arbitrary will of an irresponsible power, but the revelation of duties inhering in relationship, one could hardly avoid seeing that not the abrogation of the law, but a better understanding of its meaning and a more perfect obedience to its requirements, are what is de-

manded of us. We must recognize the fact that God continues to claim one-seventh of our time, not only that we and our servants alike may rest, but that we may remember Him, may therefore come together to worship Him, and make it altogether a holy day.

It is to be remembered that the Church herself is an ideal conception,—“a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, holy, and without blemish”; in it “every building, fitly framed together, groweth into an holy temple in the land”; its “lively stones are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.” Its people “are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people of God’s own possession”; they are predestinate, called, justified, glorified; are raised up together and made to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. Therefore her methods are ideal methods, and her doctrine is an ideal doctrine—and this with regard to the observance of the Lord’s Day as with regard to everything else.

I proceed to suggest to you an ideal family observance of the Lord’s Day. The parents, who will have reminded one another on Saturday night that the Lord’s Day is at hand, will awake with their thoughts full of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, and therefore ready to give thanks for their present resurrection in Him and their future resurrection at His glorious appearing, when the body of our humiliation shall be fashioned after the body of His glory. The consciousness of the arrival of the day, when toil is for the time done with and rest is enjoyed, will cause them to anticipate the coming of the time when all toil shall be ended and the rest which remaineth for the people of God shall be entered upon. They will be full of the expectation of spiritual refreshment when the soul, worn with the whole week’s contact with the things which are seen and temporal, can gaze upon those which are unseen and eternal. In the conflict with temptation and possibly the yielding to it in some instances, or the surging up of old sinful desires, they are jaded, and their hearts have been saddened; but to-day is a new opportunity for beginning again the new life which is due to the indwelling of the Spirit of God,

“New perils passed, new sins forgiven,
New thoughts of God, new hopes of heaven.”

Then there will be the holy, happy thought of God, of His nearness to them, of His goodness towards them, shown in many ways both of providence and of grace.

And when they come downstairs it will be with a strong desire to make this blessed day a happy day for the children. Family worship will place them together, as a family, at God’s feet, and the spirit of adoption will plead in them before their

Father's face. Solemnized, but with hearts enjoying a deep, interior peace, they go all together to God's house, and,

"Passed within the Church's door,
Where poor are rich and rich are poor,
They say the prayer and hear the word
Which thus our fathers said and heard,
Or representing solemn wise
Our all-prevailing sacrifice,
They feed in joint communion high
The life that lives eternally."

I cannot bear quoting a few more lines:

"'Tis something that we kneel and pray
With loved ones near or far away;
One God, one faith, one hope, one care,
One form of words, one hour of prayer:
Something that such high tryst we keep
With souls that 'neath Christ's altars sleep,
Till through the veil, by glimpses dim,
The blessed lost are found in Him."

Neither is it all worship for my ideal family, but the sermon is listened to and something learned from it—not seldom the word coming home with convincing, or convicting, or comforting, or guiding power, so that a message has been received from God which is food for the soul that waiteth for Him. Then, when returned from church, the sermon will be talked over, and various parts of Holy Scripture consulted, and the children will be questioned to see whether they have also been fed, and to exercise their memories, to keep them interested in the things which belong to their peace, and train them in the habit of listening to what is said, by God's minister, in His Name. At such a family's early dinner-table there will be some one or more of those who are poorer than they who will be invited even as Jesus was by the Pharisees, who asked Him to dinner on the Sabbath Day. In the afternoon, as Jesus worked miracles of healing for the sick and distressed, so these will go and visit such that they may bring some little brightness into their pained lives, or a call will be made upon some who are in sorrow that the comfort wherewith they themselves are comforted of God may be ministered to those who so sorely need it. And when the close of the day is reached they will all have a better and fuller knowledge of those Scriptures which makes a man wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus, and this hope of heaven will be more assured as they lay them down to rest in the consciousness of the guardianship of Him who is "the God of all the families of Israel."

Human life would indeed be but a poor thing were it robbed of its ideals, and there would be a fearful cessation of moral and spiritual effort if those ideals should disappear from man's vision, and there were none to bring them back to make them glow

with their pristine radiance and their alluring promise. It is the duty of the Church to see her ideal condition as held up before her by the Holy Spirit, and in her turn to teach ideal doctrine and put forth ideal methods before her children and urge them to realize them in practice; nor do I think it ought to be difficult to find in every large city in the land several families who reproduce the ideal observance of the Lord's Day in their own conduct and experience.

Nevertheless, this is far from being the case generally. I quote the words of England's Prime Minister in his recent speech at Glasgow, upon a very different subject, but singularly applicable to the one at present engaging our attention:

"(I think it is a matter for profound regret, but) after all we have to take account of the fact that, in the world in which we live, neither an individual nor a nation can venture with any prospect of felicity or success to act as if he lived in an ideal world, and not in the world which actually and in fact surrounds him."

If that means anything it means that he is a wise man and that a wise nation which, holding his inner gaze fixed upon the entrancing vision of the ideal, looks around upon the actual condition of men and things to ascertain what measures are necessary in order to obtain a nearer approximation of the ideal than has been at present reached. Surely this is the reason why (to glance for a moment at another matter) Moses, having written of the primal law of marriage, later on quoted and emphasized by Christ, yet "for the hardness of their hearts suffered them to put away their wives"; for so it was also regarding the ideal law of the Sabbath. Strictly interpreted (as it was by the later teachers of the Jews), not a single thing might one do, and if it were possible for Moses on more than one occasion to fast for forty days continuously, it were surely possible for the whole people to refrain from food for twenty-four hours each week; but, "Save that which every man must eat; this only may be done of you." "Have ye not read in the law," said our Lord, "how that on the Sabbath day the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath and are guiltless."

It ought indeed to be noted that our Lord's action with regard to the Sabbath was not a setting of Himself against it, but against those commandments and traditions of men which had turned that which had been given by God as a blessing and a freedom into a curse and a bondage; still, those actions seem to have been in the direction of accommodating practice to that which was possible under the existing conditions of His time. Yet, it may not unreasonably be argued that He was disinterring, from among the heaps of rubbish of man's laborious accumulation, the original lines of the rightful observance of the Sabbath. He declares it is nothing less than *lawful* to do good on the Sabbath Day, that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not

man for the Sabbath," and asserts that "the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath Day." This last may be taken to mean that man's *necessities* are to be ministered to before the strict obedience of the law of the Sabbath. If so, it becomes a principle by which the Church is to be governed in dealing with the adaptation of her methods to the needs of the twentieth century in the matter of the observance of the Lord's Day.

We see clearly that God has been pleased to teach the many through individuals to whom He has revealed His truth and His will. Abraham, Moses, the judge, the prophet, St. John the Baptist, and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself are the most notable instances of this. But not only so, the truth so communicated, the will or law so made known, when embodied in a system, which preserved its integrity, and held the ideal up before the conscience of the people, was nevertheless perceived and obeyed only by the few. We have three notable instances of this: the ceremonial law, the law of the tithes, and the law of the Sabbath. Hence it follows that while the Christian Church maintains before the conscience of the faithful the ideal observance of the Lord's Day, and makes allowance for the lawful exceptions to its strict and literal demands, she also shall not be discouraged at finding that only a minority in the community try to attain to that ideal observance, nor despair of the arrival of the day when the ideal shall be realized, and all shall enjoy their weekly day of rest, and spend it in the worship of God and communion with Him in whose honor it is named.

In the meantime it becomes her to say what adaptation of her methods to the needs of the age are needful or advisable. Looking back, we see a time when no blast furnaces were in operation for the melting of tons of iron ore, and no pumping engines employed for keeping a mine clear of water, when no complicated machinery, carelessly used during the week, demanded repair on the Day of Rest, when no stokers sweated before the furnaces of an ocean-going steamship, and there were no railways for the rapid conveyance of perishable foods for long distances for the necessities of great cities inhabited by millions, when no vessels carrying a thousand or two of passengers reached their destination on the Lord's Day and necessity demanded attention to their wants and distribution in various directions immediately. These are but suggestions of a change, every part of which has come upon the nations during the century which has so recently closed, and of conditions which demand of the Church that she shall adapt the methods of her observance of the Lord's Day to the actual necessities of man, as those have been developed by this rapid change.

Might not the Church make it one of her methods to endeavor to secure by her corporate action the exclusions from the list of so-called necessary works of those which are not really so, and the reduction of the hours of really necessary work to a minimum,

seeking that as many as possible shall be free to take part in some public worship of God on Sunday, and that all shall have some one day of rest in the course of every week?

It is claimed that, in the present day, work is so continuous and laborious that the Lord's Day must be taken for play and amusement. In the first place, I do not admit the correctness of the statement regarding the unending work. As far as book-keepers and counting-house clerks go, I remember the time well enough in my own experience when there was no closing of offices on Saturday afternoon at two o'clock, while now, in some places at least, the banks close on that day at noon, while, on other week-days, work does not begin before nine o'clock and is ended by six; sometimes by five o'clock. Then again in many trades and occupations the tendency is towards shortening the hours of labor, and the eight-hour day is being claimed for most departments, and in several is conceded.

But, for the sake of argument, let the statement as to the nature and continuity of the worker's task be admitted. Then the Church's method would surely be to place clearly before her children that their first duty is the public worship of God, and that when God demands this, or any other thing from us, He does it, not because it is easy for us to comply, but because it is right. And, further, recreation on the Lord's Day ought in its nature to be recreative and to be engaged in with the thought of God prominent, and His presence sanctifying it.

As regards the weekly toilers who dwell in large cities, and who must cover some miles before they can reach the country, the use of street cars and excursion trains is a necessity and is only the employment of the few for the sake of the many; provided the recreation or excursion be itself admitted to be a lawful thing for them on the Lord's Day.

The same may be said of Sunday dinners at Sherry's in New York, or the Casino in Newport, in either of which places there are probably fewer persons employed to cook and serve the viands than would be if all the parties were given in private houses—if only it be conceded by the Church that Sunday dinner parties are lawful—but, "there's the rub."

I have before in this paper pointed out that the *principle* of the Fourth Commandment governs the observance of the Lord's Day, it is necessary therefore at all ages and under all circumstances for the Church to call upon her children to "Remember the day to keep it holy."

After all, what is needed is for people to know by their own experience something of the knowledge-passing love of Christ, and of that of the Father in giving Him up for us all: for until they do they are apt to say of the worship of God—"What a weariness is it!" And those who know it not, and are engaged in business, will say, as of old—"When will the new moon be gone that we may sell corn, and the Sabbath that we may set forth

wheat!" And never will they be able to say in truth, "I was glad when they said unto me, let us go into the house of the Lord"—or, "Lord, I have loved the habitation of thy house, and the place where thine honor dwelleth." All kinds of excuses will they make to seize upon its holy hours for their own pleasure, and rob God of the time as they do of the tithes which He requires of them.

Let this ideal become the actual, and that generally, and the words of the old Jewish prophet would find a modern fulfillment. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

SATURDAY MORNING.

Seventh Topic.

THE ADAPTATION OF THE CHURCH'S METHODS TO THE NEEDS OF THE CENTURY.

(c) THE INCULCATION OF POLITICAL AND COMMERCIAL MORALITY AND THE MAINTENANCE OF HIGH IDEALS.

General Paper.

THE RIGHT REV. HENRY CODMAN POTTER, D.D., LL.D.,
BISHOP OF NEW YORK.

In the Imperial Library in Paris is an infinitely precious manuscript, which, I hope I shall not be accounted profane if I say, is made precious, most of all, not by its text but by its illustrations. The text is that of the Sermons of Gregory of Nazianza; the illustrations, which are miniature paintings, are mainly of subjects taken from the Old and New Testaments.

The most remarkable of these illustrations represents the Second Ecumenical Council held at Constantinople in A. D. 381, in which Gregory of Nazianza took part. It represents the seats of the bishops as arranged in a semicircle around a throne; but, so far as any individual prelate is concerned, the throne is vacant. It is cushioned with a purple velvet pillow, and upon this rests a large open book,—the Bible,—thus signifying that the Holy Scriptures alone are allowed to preside over the Council, and that these alone must exercise supreme judicial authority in all controverted questions.

The historian from whom I take these facts goes on to say, "The painter did not invent this scene. He did nothing but depict what occurred. We know this from the testimony of Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, who, when writing of the third Ecumenical Council, held at Ephesus in A. D. 431, says, 'The Holy Synod met in St. Mary's Church. The presidency was given to Christ Himself, for the Gospel of God reposed on the throne, and seemed to say to the members of the holy assembly, 'Be just in your judgments.'"

I have been unable to learn that any such usage obtained in the recent Council of Cardinals in Rome; but, if it did, it gives is an interesting clew to its singular wisdom in choosing a peasant for a Pope.

And indeed, whether it did or not, it may well indicate to us our wisest point of departure in the discussion which I have been asked to initiate. It would lead me too far afield if here I under-

took to point out the influences which have lowered the standards of political and commercial morality,—of which morality I am now bidden to speak,—on this continent, though I hope my British brethren will forgive me if I say that, as a matter of fact, those standards are, in some respects, higher in the United States than in almost any other land. One of the most enormous commercial interests of our time is the putting up of various food-products, both for home consumption and for exportation. As may readily be surmised, the opportunity for adulteration or for cheap substitutions in these is enormous; and an international commission of experts was not long ago appointed by the leading governments of the world to test these various food-products, and to certify as to their comparative purity. In that comparison I beg to say that the food products, in cans and in glass and the like, of the United States stood first, and those of Great Britain next. Where France, Germany, Holland, and the rest ranked need not be noted here; but it was a significant fact that, where the Calvinistic theology had held sway, the divorce between loud professions and common honesty was the widest; and where religion, in its outward expressions, was least emotional or vociferous, the harmony between label and contents was the closest.

There is a large suggestion here, if only we have eyes to see it. Political and commercial morality are widely believed to be things which (a) We may separate from the ordinary standard of conduct, or (b) Which we may regulate, and even create, by the enactment of laws.

It is at this point that the example of Jesus Christ becomes of supreme value and that we find that His teaching furnishes the only law for our modern life. He was a Jew. He inherited, as part of the tradition of His religion, that immense network of provisions which we find in the Book of Leviticus, and elsewhere in the Elder Testament, and which covered the whole life of the Hebrew with a fine and interlacing web of precept. He never poured contempt upon these precepts, nor scoffed at those who represented and expounded them. "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All, therefore, that they bid you observe, that observe and do." From time to time, as on the Sabbath Day, He brushed what Bishop Butler has called "positive," as distinguished from moral precepts, aside, and lifted obligation into its highest, because divinest, lights. But the whole trend of Christ's earthly ministry was in the direction of organized ecclesiastical life, of definite and authoritatively imposed obligations; in one word, of system in religion.

In the inculcation, however, of that system, and, though He "went into the Synagogue on the Sabbath Day," there can be no smallest doubt as to what He held to be supreme. He found a generation and an ecclesiasticism honeycombed with formalism and self-complacency, and it is vain that we seek to minimize those thunders with which He smote the Scribes and Pharisees

and theatrical ὑποκριτοί of his time. He saw, with a divine and unerring discernment, the pitiful worthlessness of the washing of cups and platters; and when He stood up to read in the Synagogue at Capernaum, with His Divine heart aching for the sorrowful and the heavy-laden who were in vain seeking courage and consolation in a worn-out ceremonialism, He read of One who "broke not the bruised reed, nor quenched the smoking flax," and straightway there dawned upon their tear-clouded eyes who listened the vision of a Father whose religion was not the length of a phylactery or of a Sabbath-Day's journey, but love and mercy and the eternal righteousness!

I do not wonder that the Church has widely forgotten this, nor that she is too often dumb concerning the Spirit that ought to animate her, the Soul that ought to throb beneath the ribs of death; and voluble, rather, concerning the mint and anise and cummin with which to perfume the ecclesiastical carcass. Christianity entered the world, let it never be forgotten, at a moment when the genius of organization, under the wise insight of the Roman Empire, reigned supreme. The miracle of an articulated civilization, which ought not to have been so novel to the Hebrew, since it was only what Israelitish law had done for a race of Egyptian bondmen,—that miracle was working its astounding transformations among Goths and Vandals when the Catholic Church began its campaigns of conquest and followed upon the heels of the victories of Emperors. Christian leaders caught the spirit of the hour; and, to a Paganism impotent and outworn, as are Buddhism and Shintoism in China and Japan to-day, the new faith came with a mighty spell and glowed, before long, with new and resplendent ceremonial. I wish I had time to show how all this fitted in with the spirit of the hour, and how inevitable came to be that separation of religion from the affairs of common life which, strangely enough, survived the Reformation and has reappeared in some of the religious teachings and fellowships which are most remote from Latin Christianity. I began life, as some of my brethren here know, in a counting-room; and I can never forget the shock which came to me when one of the partners, a Presbyterian elder, in the house in which I was a clerk, said to me, in instructing me one day in my duties as a salesman: "Here, Harry" (striking with his hand a case of broadcloths), "here, Harry, you must make your profits; for the ordinary Southern or Western buyer knows nothing about them"; or, when a sainted bishop, now gone to his reward, when speaking on one occasion of the colored people of his diocese, said, "Yes, they lie a good deal, and steal a good deal, and get drunk, and commit adultery. . . . but, thank God, . . . they hold the Catholic faith;" and I was not surprised when another bishop sitting hard by, and who is also no longer living, exclaimed, "That is rather a serious indictment for the Catholic faith!"

But, as you and I know, the Catholic faith is not responsible for such misreading of its teaching, but the clouded or perverse vision of those who misread it. And so, in an age which has come so widely as ours to see in the Church a venerable and picturesque, but somewhat superannuated tradition, I think we see our calling. An eminent authority in the realm of theology, in another communion, in connection with his inauguration as the head of a theological training school, has lately declared that the twentieth century is to see the most tremendous struggle which has yet come to pass between the disciples of the supernatural and those of the naturalistic school. I believe he is right, and that the impression that it was the example and teaching of Jesus rather than something not of this world that shone through them both, that is to redeem and ennoble the race—I believe, I say, that any such impression of the secret of the divine life is doomed to bitter disappointment. But if it shall be so, it will be because the Church has come to recognize that it is not by the mere repetition of formulas which affirm a supernatural “credo” that she is to touch and transform the heart of man; but rather by such an upward-looking faith as shall lay hold upon those supernatural forces that are within the veil, and bring them down to be guides and inspirers of men. Worship, apart from conduct, ceremonies without the sacrifice that shall reveal the Cross to which they have led us; mere emotionalism, whether it shall express itself in a shout or in a rite, this is something which our cool-eyed, modern observer has come to estimate at its true value; and it is in vain that sectarian ingenuity or ecclesiastical traditionalism offers them as substitutes for something else! The world waits to see religion vindicating its place in our modern society by drawing about it those who “do justly, and love mercy, and walk humbly with their God,” and it will believe in the supernatural origin and power of our faith just as soon as it sees it doing supernatural things in the hearts and lives of men! Instead of believing that you may put business and religion into two separate compartments, and resent as an impertinence all endeavor to govern our daily tasks by the law of a divine life, it will persist in going back to that life itself as it is portrayed for us in the pages of the New Testament, and asking us, “How far are conduct and conversation regulating themselves, in the case of each one of us, by that?”

I do not know how it may be with others, but in my own observation and experience that is the teaching of power and influence which concerns itself with this. The man who is in the shop, or the office, or the field, is forever under the pressure of a secularism which obscures, if it does not destroy in him, all moral standards. To recover these from the welter of our modern civilization, with its greed, its frivolity, and its cynicism, this plainly is the first office of the religious teacher, and then, to show how inextricably a lofty ideal is bound up with all the

enduring achievement, whether of a nation or of a man, this surely is the highest aim whether of the Church or of her three-fold ministry, wherever it may be called upon to serve!

And as we may not separate religion from conduct, as little may we expect the loftiest virtue as the fruit of mere rules. Ours is an age of mechanisms; and as we make all other things by machinery, so are we coming to believe that we can produce character by the same methods. There never was a wilder dream! A clever divine said the other day in my hearing that a modern city rector wanted, most of all, the gifts of the manager of a department store. And he was partly right! We have mechanized religion until its chief office seems to be to conduct an organized institution of recreation, or refreshment, or relief. There is undoubtedly in much of this a wholesome reaction from that "other-worldliness" which was the chief note in the sectarianisms in which some of us were bred, and which found the main use of this present world to consist in getting hopefully out of it. But the error of much of our modern reaction consists in its mistaking means for ends; and, most of all, in its abounding faith in mere machinery as the most potential factor, whether in ennobling the state, or in transforming a man. No grave national or municipal scandal is unearthed without a pathetic demand upon our law-makers for a new law which shall make health, and equity, and virtue the common possession of all the people. There is at hand a tragic illustration of this of which I shall speak here, because to be silent concerning it would be to make of this whole discussion a grotesque impertinence. In the United States to-day, and in some measure I suppose in Canada,—for across the border there are labor unions as well as here,—there is a situation in our industrial, and, as an inevitable consequence, in our commercial world, whose moral and spiritual aspects least of all engage public attention; and yet, whose ultimate adjustment must reach down to these as its only and final hope. I have again and again heard bishops and other clergy discuss these questions, but always with one conclusion, viz., that laws must, somewhere and somehow, be passed which would resolve existing difficulties by wholesome and inexorable coercion. We are not told who are to draft these laws, nor how they are to be passed. We are not informed as to whence the public sentiment is to come which is to make a way for us through what now looks like a hopeless *impasse*; nor how, when once it has been found, it is to reach its ends. Above all, we are not enlightened as to how you are to enforce a law when the majority of the people are hostile to its enforcement. And all the while the battle rages; and men's passions grow hotter, and men's language grows fiercer,—and the Church is dumb. Not one of her public teachers in twenty has knowledge enough to make him competent to deal with the subject; and if he had, not one in a hundred has the courage to do so! And

yet, here is a matter which is concerned supremely with the eternal equities, and which clamors most of all for the application to it of the law of a divine brotherhood!

Believe me, men and brethren, we have here the noblest possible sphere for "the inculcation of a divine morality, both political and commercial, and the maintenance of high ideals." One there was who once walked the world in garment of our flesh, who drew men together and never drove them apart! What was His Spirit, and what were His methods? I end as I began. He had no patented, reticulated law of daily living. Least of all did he imitate the civilizations of His time, which bade virtue withdraw from men and live in lofty seclusion. He was neither Diogenes in his tub nor Cicero in his Tusculan villa. But He sought for men wherever He could find them; and then He touched them with the magic spell of a high ideal. Whenever one is pining for specific direction and definitions for particular duties or sins, he may well remember him who came to the Master and said, "Lord, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me!" A merely human reformer would have at once sat down and said, "My dear friend, this property must be parceled out in such and such portions." That is, in effect, what modern socialism says—and all that it can say! But Jesus says, "Man, who made me a judge or divider over thee?" Get the great law of a divine fatherhood and human brotherhood at work in your heart, and you will not swindle your kinsman by creating a trust to entrap him; nor, by buying shares in it, take advantage of your less-favored fellow men who, unlike you, are not let in on the "ground floor." In other words, whether you are buyer or seller, borrower or lender, donor or recipient, do not be governed by low and unworthy motives, but ask for the inspiration and guidance of high ones!

And then, finally, try and touch all that network of political and commercial life that surrounds you, as did your Master, with the spell of sympathy! Our lust of classification, and our lack of charity, combine to propel us towards those swift judgments of our fellow men which are often as false as they are cruel. Not so did Jesus come to Matthew, to Zaccheus, to the Magdalene. Somewhere in each of these, He believed, there survived the divine ideal. It is the office of the Church and of the ministry to-day, not only to believe in such an ideal, but, by patience and tenderness, and human sympathy, to quicken its spell upon our fellow men!

SATURDAY MORNING.

*Eighth Topic.*THE ADAPTATION OF THE CHURCH'S METHODS TO
THE NEEDS OF THE CENTURY.(c) THE INCULCATION OF POLITICAL AND COMMERCIAL
MORALITY AND THE MAINTENANCE
OF HIGH IDEALS.*Second Paper.*

THE RIGHT REV. BOYD VINCENT, D.D.,
BISHOP COADJUTOR OF SOUTHERN OHIO.

This is mainly a question of needs and methods. But back of this lies another question, viz: What is the Church's duty in such a field of morals? Has she any such duty?

It was pointed out with admirable simplicity by the late Bishop of London that all men have a sense of right and wrong, though they do not always respond to it; but just because believers in Jesus Christ are themselves taught by Him the will of God more certainly and endowed by Him with spiritual power to realize it, therefore it is their duty to influence the world's life, also, "by breathing into it a higher spirit and giving it greater moral consistency."

This seems to give us a clew to our first answer. In other words, the Church has a duty to the world outside her own membership, not only in holding up Christ's moral teaching as its absolute ethical standard, but also in helping to enforce this—in her own way. For the real trouble with the world's morals, after all, is not that men do not know what is right, but that they are so unwilling to do it. Everywhere in the civilized world, at least, the beauty and force of Christ's ethical teaching are admitted. It is when the principles of that teaching come into conflict with the other motives which so strongly sway men that the world's conduct is so glaringly inconsistent. So that it is right here, if anywhere, viz., in the more consistent application of principle, that any real moral progress in the world is to be hoped for.

And so it must be right here, too, that the Church ought to bring her influence to bear to-day most practically—viz., in constant and confident appeals to men's consciences, as an ineradicable part of their nature; then, in insisting, as she alone can, on the divine authority of conscience, not merely as the voice of experience, but as the voice of God; and so on its absolute obligation on all men, under all circumstances, and in all affairs, even on the

largest scale. It may be well enough, for lack of other convictions, to say with Matthew Arnold:

"Hath man no second life?—*Pitch this one high!*
Sits there no judge in Heaven, our sin to see?
More strictly, then, the inward judge obey!
Was Christ a man like us? *Ah! let us try*
If we then, too, can be such men as he!"

But the world itself sees the need of higher and more conclusive sanctions, and is quick to respond to such a tribute as that paid the late Lord Salisbury:

"His soul was on the mountains, while his feet
Went where the girded peace of Europe trod.
Above the throne he saw the Judgment Seat;
Beyond the frontiers of our star, the rod
Of Heaven's majesty, Eternal God!"

So much in general for the Church's ethical function in the world.

When we turn next to the special Needs of our day in the matter of political and commercial morality, what do we find? What are the latest and most salient facts?

First, in the field of international politics, a marvelous extension of the geographical boundaries of men's interests; new world-powers—our own among them—suddenly appearing on the scene; new continents being opened up to conquest, offering new spheres of political influence and new doors to commercial enterprise, all appealing, on the most colossal scale, to the ambition and selfishness of nations. But it is not here, in this field of international morals—at least not for our English-speaking peoples—that our special need lies. Venice, long ago, could commit an irreparable crime against Europe, when, in her political and commercial greed, she turned aside the Fourth Crusade to the conquest of Constantinople, and so broke down the last barrier against the invading Turk. And in more recent times we have seen Germany (in the Bishop of Albany's scathing phrase) "accepting a coaling station as compensation for murdered missionaries of the Cross." But of England even a Turkish ambassador could lately say: "It is her respect for public law which commands the confidence of other nations and makes her real power in Europe. It is because she takes her stand on principles and on the sanctity of treaties, and is not supposed to be open to the bribes so freely dangled before other States." Our own country, too, has shown herself no less honorable and made herself no less strong in keeping international faith with Cuba, and in her straightforward insistence on simple justice in China. Besides, I doubt whether we always realize what an ethical high-water mark has been reached in our day in the exceptional readiness of this

country and England to resort to international arbitration—not, mark you, for the sake of peace merely, but above all for the sake of justice. I hope I may be pardoned if I call attention in this presence to a striking example of such a spirit in the declaration of a leading English newspaper, within the last forty-eight hours, with reference to the recent Boundary Award, viz.: “We have the fullest confidence that the decision we deplore was absolutely required by the justice of the case.” It is this noble confidence, so often justified, in the prevalence of the right, which makes the greatest glory of these nations to-day. We can trust their honor in this field of international morals.

It is when we come to the field of our own domestic politics and most characteristic commercial transactions that the Church's voice most needs to be heard to-day. We all know what a shameful spectacle in these respects we present to the eyes of the world—national interests defeated and the wheels of government blocked, not only by party politics, but by the covert demands of great corporations; a decent civil service still struggling for its very life against the greed of the spoils system: the political honor and independence of whole States prostituted to the personal advantage of party leaders; municipal interests dominated and defied by bosses and rings; corruption and blackmail almost everywhere. On the other hand, vast combinations of capital, overawing legislatures; defying the law even while ostensibly complying with it; relentlessly crushing all competition; deliberately creating false values; heartlessly disregarding all individual rights and robbing helpless investors of millions of dollars in an hour. Only think of it! The aggregate capital of new industrial consolidations in this country in 1898 was nine hundred millions of dollars, and in 1899 three thousand one hundred millions. What a menace all this is to our national honor, to say nothing of our prosperity, unless men can be made to feel that, even in the conduct of such interests, they cannot really escape from moral responsibility. A sagacious foreign critic has recently published the opinion that “the standard of personal morality in America is decidedly higher than in England, that of commercial morality probably a little lower, and that of political morality quite distinctly lower.” President Hadley, in commenting on this very moderate statement, declares that such a failure to carry into politics and business the same moral standards as men apply in their private lives is “due to a defect in public judgment rather than to a weakness in individual character.” And to make his meaning clearer he points out three stages in the growth of civilization: first, that in which public conduct is regulated by force; next, by respect for law; and lastly, by respect for public opinion. How true all this is was aptly illustrated a few weeks ago in the little town of Oxford, Ohio, when a ruffian who had deliberately shot down an officer was instantly seized and swung to a tree. It was a thrilling ex-

ample, though, of the reverse spirit in American citizenship when another brave officer calling out only "In the name of the law!" was allowed to cut the rope in the very hands of the mob, and carry off the half-dead culprit to prison. But it was a crowning instance of what ought to be more and more the last controlling factor in our public conduct, when on the following Sunday all the churches in the little town were closed, and so, under Christian initiative and on the very spot of the mob violence, all decent citizens in mass meeting openly denounced it.

This shows us the point, then, where the Church's duty and the public need must meet, viz., in the creation and maintenance of an entirely new code of political and commercial ethics—or, if you choose to call it so, of a body of public moral sentiment—which shall be stronger and wider reaching even than the law, and far surer to execute itself. As it is now, all sorts of excuses are found for giving conscience the go-by. Principle is supposed to be altogether lost in space; and we are told that the "Ten Commandments are no good west of the Mississippi River." Legality once satisfied, how can there be any other questions; for is it not true that "corporations have no consciences"? Self-interest cannot be expected to know anything of other interests; while as for the public interest, "Oh,"—in Mr. Vanderbilt's classic phrase—"Oh! the public be ——blessed!" All the more, then, because of just such a vicious spirit among us does it need to be insisted on again and again that politics and business, on whatever scale, are not mere "games," where there are no more considerations, moral or immoral, in winning, than in football or a boat race; that public office is a solemn trust for the public good, which it is a crime to abuse to private gain; that money-making corporations do not exist exclusively or even primarily for the benefit of promoters and directors, but for that of investors; and that the question of rights as between capital and labor is more than a merely economic one. Of course we understand how the man of "practical politics," or the financial manipulator, regards all such ideas; we know what scant respect he has for the "literary fellers." Nevertheless, these ideas are more than academic opinions; they are moral truths, which no decent man dares to deny individually; and therefore we are sure that in every community there is a public moral nerve which will make itself felt at last, if it be only excited strongly enough and steadily enough. Of course, too, no such new code of political and commercial ethics can be expected to establish itself at once, or always to execute itself completely. There are practical difficulties, and immense ones, in the way in the shape of the political "machine" and the legal powers of corporations. Too often have we seen public reforms defeated by such means and the guilty go unpunished. But, thank Heaven! we have also seen such reforms succeed, in spite of such obstacles, and the guilty punished at last. The fact is, and it is an all-important one, that reaction comes only when public spirit and

public pressure begin to flag. But the world has been made better in the long run, and its greatest reforms accomplished by just such accumulated public sentiment; and it can be made better still, if only those of us who are divinely charged with the duty persist in doing our duty and in the wisest ways.

And so we come finally to the question of Methods: How shall this Church adapt herself to the changed conditions? How shall she bring her moral influence to bear on the world to-day more effectively?

1. First of all and last of all, of course, in training the individual conscience. This she has done faithfully in the past, even in her worship. To this let many high-minded statesmen and financiers among her own children bear witness; or even a French statesman, who, being asked when he expected to see the morals of France reformed, "Never," he exclaimed, "until the Church of God publicly teaches the Commandments of God again in a language understood of the people."

Unquestionably, too, this Church has, up to a certain point, been faithful in her inculcation of morals from her pulpit. But just as unquestionably our pulpit has lagged far behind that of other religious bodies in direct and courageous dealing with the moral issues in public affairs. We have even prided ourselves on the fact and been rather amused than otherwise by the popular fling that "the Episcopal Church never interferences with a man's politics—or his religion." That is all well enough if the Church's concern is only with the personal religious character and conduct of her own members, and not at all with the affairs of the world outside. But if, as we have seen, that is a mistake, and the Kingdom of God is really meant to be leaven to the lump; if the Church is really set as a city on a hill, and a light in a dark place, to guide the world itself to righteousness, then her preachers ought to make their voices heard on such subjects when necessary, and with no uncertain sound. If it be objected that the men who need such preaching most do not go to Church to-day, still it is to be replied that the civilized world was never readier to listen to the Church as a teacher of morals, and to feel that here, at least, she speaks with an authority which neither the press nor the platform can claim. Besides, if more of our bishops and clergy, instead of dealing in their sermons only with mere generalities, dealt oftener and more practically in this way with the living moral issues in public affairs, they would not only have their pews oftener filled, but win a speedy hearing and constituency also outside the walls of their Churches.

Even the Church's teaching function might be utilized in such a cause as never before. Is it enough that in her Catechism she should simply indoctrinate her children in the faith and in the general principles of morals, and then give them no further practical hint of how those principles are to be applied? There are a

thousand questions of duty in after life never dreamed of even in that formidable catechetical answer called "My Duty towards my Neighbor." One of the most glaring defects in our public-school system for years was that it failed in the very object for which it was primarily established, viz., in teaching civic duties and so in forming character for American citizenship. And again, one of the most striking ideas in the "higher education" of our day is that the prime purpose even of our colleges and universities is to make every student realize his civic responsibility and the duty of fitting himself for public service in some form. Why should not the Church, too, with such needs as we have seen pressing upon her, look far enough afield to train her Christian children in the same high ideals and duties of public life? Most of you probably know of the recent movement in the direction of what is called "The Ethical Sunday-school"; and fanciful and fatuous as such a thing seems at first thought, yet examination is sure to impress you with its value. Not as a substitute, of course, for ordinary Sunday-school teaching, but as a supplement. I know at least one public-spirited young clergyman in Cincinnati who avails himself of the absentee privilege in her public-school law, and always trains his Sunday-school children at least one week-day afternoon, at the parish house, in just such ethical ideals and duties.

And why should not our theological seminaries be made to contribute more to the same result? Dear old Bishop Williams used to say that "of all the instrumentalities which it pleases an All-wise and All-merciful God to employ for the edification of his people and the redemption of the world, the most useless and most helpless is the callow youth just graduated from a theological school." And no less an authority than the Dean of the Andover Seminary recently said: "The time has come to differentiate. If what we want is simply scholars and theologians and dogmatists in our pulpits, then the old seminary curriculum is well enough. But if what we want is ministers to the world of a living Gospel and leaders of the people in all civic and social righteousness, then what we need most is a training school rather than a mere library and classrooms." Making all allowance for extravagance of statement, I think we shall all agree that the proposition is substantially true.

2. This suggests another respect in which this Church's methods can be improved, viz., in a larger personal and official activity of her bishops and clergy in all public reform movements. None of us are ignorant, of course, of the fact that some of our Episcopal brethren, both in this country and in England, have of late years been called on to arbitrate in certain public affairs,—and with what happy results! And this because the public had not only confidence in their personal integrity, justness, and wisdom, but respect also for their representative official position. Not all of us, of course, would think ourselves qualified to serve

in such a capacity; but more of us might readily become so, if we oftener showed ourselves really thoughtful and concerned about such rights of our fellow men.

3. But the form in which this Church most needs to make her moral influence felt to-day is in more confident and constant appeals to the public conscience—I mean, in more courageous and authoritative pronouncement, in her corporate capacity, of her moral judgments upon the world's conduct. With one or two notable exceptions in our legislation, we have been far too timid and conservative in this respect in the past; perhaps, with what we considered a becoming modesty, or perhaps because of some supposed divine limitation of the Church's moral function in the world. We may not forget, of course, that the Master Himself directly refused to interfere in affairs which properly belonged to Cæsar; but we must also remember that he did not hesitate to emphasize for all men the things which belong to God. He would not consent to act as "a judge and divider" between men, within the realm of the civil law; but He did not hesitate to speak as a Teacher, in the larger scope of the moral law, and distinctly bid both parties "beware of covetousness." Surely His Church may do as much to-day and ought to. Other Churches among us, even the least historic and most multiple, deliver their formal pronouncements on such matters, and are listened to. The Church of Rome, Rome calmly conscious and assertive of her rights in this respect, has always done so, and still does so. Consider only half a dozen of the titles of the thirty odd encyclicals and other carefully considered deliverances of the late Pope Leo to the world—for example: "On the Evils Affecting Modern Society"; on "Socialism, Communism, and Nihilism"; on "Christian Marriage"; on "The Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens"; on "The Condition of the Working Classes"; on "Allegiance to the Republic." Can any man withhold his admiration from such faithful efforts of this part of Christ's Church to do her duty in the moral guidance of the world? With all the world's discount, too, of the other claims of the Church of Rome, men do recognize her right to speak to them in such matters, and do listen to her.

And, now, I ask you, is it not time that this Church of ours, so conscious, too, of her historic life and Catholic character, should arouse herself from her timid conservatism, and, as an integral part of the Church of God, assert her divine authority in like formal and public moral judgments? Has she not now won a position and influence in this land, to say nothing of her rights and prestige in England and in Canada, such as to justify her in such a course? For it is not the power of numbers, it is moral weight, the force of authority and character which counts in such a connection. The more we believe in ourselves, in this way, and justify it by our wisdom and courage, the more will the public believe in us, too. When the Convention of the Diocese of Massa-

chusetts sent a copy of her pronouncement upon the recent labor troubles to the President of the United States, it was received with more than respect; it was acknowledged with gratitude. Church Congresses may debate themselves hoarse on such subjects, and their deliverances may all be interesting and even helpful in themselves, but they carry no final convictions, for there is no recognized authority behind them. Even such a dignified Episcopal Conference as this may discuss matters of vital concern to ourselves, and the public be no wiser or better when we shall have done. But let this Church, in her full corporate capacity and authority, in her diocesan synods and Episcopal addresses—above all, in the pastorals of her House of Bishops and the action of her General Convention, instead of speaking only to her own immediate constituency or everlastingly discussing only her own organization and administration, speak oftener and more dogmatically on the great moral issues in public affairs, and she too, will make herself heard and heeded. Already she is doing more than any other Church, both here and in Canada, to form public opinion and practice in the matter of divorce and remarriage. Why should it not be so with her in respect to all great public moral issues?

The danger in all this is clear enough, of course—the danger of misjudgments and seeming partisanship. But let this Church only be careful and deliberate enough in her pronouncements to start with, and then, instead of herself pronouncing directly on men and measures, pronounce, rather, after the Scriptural model and at the right critical moment, God's everlasting judgments in principles (for about these she is always sure), and then she can not only afford to run all other risks, but is bound to.

4. Lastly, there is one other consideration in this connection and that is such righteous conduct by this Church of her own affairs as shall still further justify her, to the world's eyes, in any such claims as its moral teacher and judge. Taking warning by an illustrious example to the contrary, she must keep her hands out of politics proper, and continue to be above even a suspicion of interest in them beyond the legitimate range of her moral judgment. She must scrutinize more carefully than she always has done the character of the men to whom she intrusts the conduct even of her temporal affairs, and who are so often canonized in her parish memorials. Above all, she must be more chary of the money which comes into her hands from sources that are manifestly open to criticism. The present Bishop of New York (if he will allow me), in a graceful eulogium once upon one of Philadelphia's most noted financiers and philanthropists, nobly characterized his wealth, both in its making and its spending, in a single telling phrase, when he said, "It was all clean money!" Would that the Church might always say this of her benefactors! She could teach and judge, then, with all the more confidence.

SUNDAY MORNING.

SERMON AT THE CLOSING SERVICE.

SYSTEM, UNITY, PROGRESS.

THE RIGHT REV. FREDERICK COURTNEY, D.D.,

BISHOP OF NOVA SCOTIA.

"And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."—Eph. iv. 11, 12, 13.

System, unity, progress—these are what these sentences emphasize, and they are the watchwords of their author, whenever he treats of Christ and the Church.

I. SYSTEM.

There have been two great revelations of Himself which God has been pleased to make, which are mentioned and characterized by the Evangelist St. John in the phrase, "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth by Jesus Christ"; and each of these was embodied in and perpetuated by a system. When Moses had received that revelation of God as the self-existent One, taught him by the exhibition of a fire of such a character as did not require the material bush on which to sustain its life, for "the bush was not burnt"; in which revelation was gathered up that of the Divine Being made known to the antediluvians as the Creator, and to the patriarchs as the Almighty; and supplemented by the cloud, and trumpet, and fire, and thunder of Sinai, at which he did "exceedingly fear and quake"; it speedily found a home and an abiding place in that elaborate system known as the moral and ceremonial law, in which tabernacle, sacrifice, and priesthood, and, later on, judges and kings and schools of prophets, found their appropriate places. "See that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the Mount," was the direction given to him, in obedience to which his system was constructed. It were strange indeed, if He who, in thus revealing Himself in divers portions and divers manners to the fathers, made use of a system in which that revelation might be enshrined and preserved, and in His still earlier revelation of His eternal power and Godhead embodied that in the vast system of the universe, had not designed a system in which to enshrine and preserve that fuller and complete revelation of Himself which He made by a Son, and of which it is written, "No man hath seen God at

any time; the only Begotten which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."

Think for a moment of the two terms of which our Lord Himself makes use. His very first utterance in entering upon His public ministry is, "The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand." And what is a kingdom if it be not an ordered and defined system, in which the administration of government is provided for through the various offices of State? He speaks also of His Church as that which He will build upon a certain rock; but what sort of a construction can that be which has no system? Again, what is the idea conveyed in the words of the text that "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers"; if it be not that these are to fulfill sundry functions in the application of a system to the needs of the members of it? Again, the similes made use of by the inspired writers lead to the same conclusion. The Church is spoken of as a body, a building, an army, a household, a family—and every one of these implies a system.

Certainly there is no encouragement in Holy Scripture for the idea which some have held, that, whereas the literal laws and ordinances of the Mosaic system have given place to a revelation of principles and the dispensation of the Spirit, therefore Christianity is a religion of individual Christian men, each with his psalm, expressive of his personal experience; his doctrine, which to him is all-important to be believed and uttered forth; his interpretation, which is the only legitimate one; his tongue, which he must speak whether any understand it or not; his own special revelation, in the declaration of which every other is to see an open heaven and a deeper understanding of the mysteries of God. All this St. Paul himself condemns and sets aside with the enunciation of the principle, "God is not the author of confusion, but of order, in all the Churches of the saints."

Let us all, then, recognize the fact that the revelation which God has been pleased to make of Himself in His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, is preserved for the succeeding generations of mankind in a system called a Church and a Kingdom, which system, like that of the State, and that of the family (which also have God for their author), exists, not for the purpose of cramping and stunting the individual, but of enabling him to fulfill himself and to accomplish more than he could possibly effect if there were no system, or he lived outside it.

II. UNITY.

There are two unities mentioned in the new Testament, or, if you will, two aspects or phases of the one unity. The former is that which exists now—St. Paul calls it "The unity of the Spirit"—the other is that which lies in the future, and of which he

speaks in the words of the text, "The unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God."

I ask you, brethren, to consider the salient points of the revelation of God in Christ, in order that we may have some sense of how great, wonderful, and stupendous they are.

Begin with Christ's statement to those Jews which believed in Him—"If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth." Of the same nature with this is his declaration to Pilate's "Thou sayest that I am a King; to this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I might bear witness unto *the truth*."

Add now His promise to the disciples regarding the work of the Holy Spirit—"He shall guide you into *all truth*." After this, His assertion "*I am the truth*"—and finally His statement "No one knoweth who the Son is but the Father."

Again, think of St. John's record, "the Word was made flesh" in connection with St. Paul's language, "He emptied Himself." Then, as regards His work—"God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them"; or, "He made Him the sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." Or, finally, "The mystery of God, both of the Father and of Christ, in which are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

Turn your attention to some of the topics denominated *mysteries, i. e.*, things which were hidden before, but are now made known to the Christian Church.

There is the mystery of iniquity. There is the mystery "that the Gentiles *are* fellow-heirs and of the same body, and partakers of His promise."

There is the mystery of "Christ in you, the hope of glory." There is the mystery of Israel's present excision and their future regrafting into their own olive tree. Think of these, and then shall we not exclaim with St. Paul, as he looks on to the time when all Israel shall be saved, "Oh, the *depth* of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God; how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!"

Even from this bare enumeration, our consciousness must be imbued with some sense of their magnitude, in the demand which they make upon the human *heart* to expand to their embracing, and the human *mind* to their comprehension. It is indeed the fact that, at the first, the disciples of the Christian Church "all continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship." But let us not fail to recognize that the revelation being what it was, and human nature being what it is, it was neither possible nor desirable for that state of things to continue. The same subjects appear to different minds in differing ways. Individuals in the same nation, according to their temperament, disposition, education, environment, are variously acted upon by the same truth. There are also national and racial temperaments and dis-

positions and characters of mind. The Jew and the Greek cannot receive truth in the same way, nor regard it from the same standpoint.

The followers of St. James—*i. e.*, those who call themselves after his name—interpreted the revelation in Christ differently from those of St. Paul. It is notorious that Easterners and Westerners think after a very different fashion. The same is true of English, Scotch, and Irish; of Northerners and Southerners in the United States—of Indians and white men over the whole continent of North America—of Chinese and Japanese and the dwellers in Oceanica. If this is true regarding many subjects of interest common to the whole human race, it will hold good regarding that which we believe to be the inheritance of the whole—*viz.*: the contents of the Gospel, the revelation of God in Christ. Thinking so, and men feeling strongly upon this subject, which to them is the most important that can command their attention, one cannot, in looking back, very greatly wonder, not only at the disputes and controversies, the animosities and hostilities, the contentions and heresies, which arose one after another to trouble the peace of the Church; but at the great schism between the East and West, the further schism in Western Christendom resulting from the Reformation in the sixteenth century, and the later rending of the robe of Christ by the setting off of the various Protestant Communions.

Are these things, then, of little moment, about which we need not disturb ourselves? Indeed they are not. Are they not evil and to be deplored; in the coming of which much of self-will, intolerance, unbelief, rejection of truth, ambition, and positive sin had a part? Indeed they are. Should we not do what in us lies to remedy such evils and to cry out against them? Indeed we should.

But, with regard to some at least of these, we may believe that God's voice can be heard as clearly as when the prophet said to the gathered hosts of Judah, on the point of starting out to bring back the revolted ten tribes into subjection to the son of Solomon: "Ye shall not go up, nor fight against your brethren; return every man to his house; for this thing *is from me.*" And as, in God's idea, the unity of the nation subsisted, in spite of, and deep down beneath, the visible separation of the ten tribes, so it is to-day; the underlying unity of the spirit subsists, in spite of, and deep down beneath, all these racial and other distinctions and separations, for it is a unity deeper than them all, deeper than the division between the Protestant Communions around us and ourselves; deeper than the division between ourselves and Rome; and between Rome and the Greek Church—aye, deeper even than the difference between Christian and Jew, for "in Christ there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all and in all; Ye *are* all one in Christ Jesus."

Now and then there comes some partial recognition of this underlying unity of the Spirit; when, for instance, the story of some hero of the faith is carried round the world and the hearts of all, everywhere, thrilled with the narrative of his deeds, mutually recognize the working of the Holy Ghost, without which no such deeds had been possible; or when a writer of deep spirituality or great knowledge in divine things opens a whole heaven of truth and brings Christ nearer than ever to hearts that love Him, in every community and every country where his writings penetrate—sometimes, when some separated Body not only undertakes, but accomplishes, grand work for God.

Meantime, we look forward to the coming of the future unity—"the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God"; faith and knowledge striving together, that the mind may at last understand what the heart has believed.

Tennyson has expressed this most felicitously in the well-known words:

"We have but faith, we cannot know;
For knowledge is of things we see—
We trust, O Lord, it comes from Thee,
A beam in darkness, let it grow,
Let knowledge grow to more and more,
But more of reverence with us dwell
That mind and heart, according well,
May make our music as before,
But vaster. . . ."

What I have said implies that the Holy Spirit is by degrees teaching the universal Church of Christ by all the events in her history, so that she may at last, in her totality, come to an agreement in the understanding of that revelation which she has received, and in which she has all along believed. If this is so, I suppose that when that future unity is reached, the older, and what are commonly called the historic Churches, will have much to learn of what God has been teaching them through the separated brethren; and that the separated brethren will have chiefly to learn from the historic Churches the value of those things which they discarded (as seems in every case to have been inevitable), when their exodus took place.

III. PROGRESS.

The need of this can, I think, be best illustrated by the case of St. Paul himself. You will remember that he tells the Galatians that he received his Gospel "by revelation of Jesus Christ"; the Corinthians, "I received of the Lord Jesus that which also I delivered unto you"; the Ephesians, "that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery"; the Corinthians again, that he was "caught up to the third heaven," "to paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter."

If anyone might consider that he knew enough, and that it was unnecessary to progress beyond the point already reached, that man must be St. Paul. But what says he of himself as to his desire and action, in his Epistle to the Philippians? "That I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death: If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may lay hold of that for which also I was laid hold of by Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have laid hold."

The attitude of the apostle is the attitude of the whole Church. To her, as to him, the revelation has been made, the idea has been displaced. By her as by him the idea has been seen, the revelation has been believed. She, as he did, "counts all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus the Lord." Thought in her members on this revelation is different, as in him at successive stages of his experience, and the language, in which endeavor is made to express the thoughts, is inadequate. But each contributes as he is able to the whole, and from time to time the whole Church, in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds—or some portion of the Church—expresses its faith and its apprehension of its meaning in some other form of words, which by degree is outgrown and felt to be no longer a suitable expression for conveying the thought to succeeding ages. But no individual, nor any one set or race of men, can give adequate expression to the idea as it exists in God—so it is, "till we *all* come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God *a* perfect man."

Christ is man—perfect man—God's idea in perfect expression. The entire human race must progress, through its varied experience, by its most careful, painstaking, and accurate thought, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, until it reaches "the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

We bishops, in our Conference, have been carefully considering certain questions which have been specially brought to our attention, as affecting the welfare of that portion of Christ's Church which is committed to us, with the hope of gaining a better, more accurate understanding of them, and of those parts of God's great revelation which are involved in them; so making our contribution to that totality which will be finally reached, and which will be "the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

It is but a very small contribution which even such a body can make to that great and glorious whole. It is but a partial apprehension which we can gain of the meaning and significance of God's great Gospel—the revelation of Jesus Christ. But it is only by everyone in the Church opening the eye of his spirit to see "that light which never was on land and sea," "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ,"

then, rejoicing in the possession of eternal life (for "this is life eternal, to know God and Jesus Christ whom He did send"), to reverently meditate upon its meaning, under the teaching of the Holy Ghost, applying it to the needs and circumstances of daily life, and giving expression to what is learned, that the coming unity and coming perfection can be reached. Be it ours, brethren, while giving God thanks for what He has revealed and rejoicing in the possession of his great salvation, to live as His children, endued by His Spirit, walking in the light as He is in the light; to say from our hearts, "Peace be with all them that love our lord Jesus Christ in sincerity"—to endeavor "to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace," and to do what in us lies to hasten the coming of that "unity in the faith and knowledge of the Son of God" which will bring about that visible unity for which He so earnestly prayed.

APPENDIX.

TRIENNIAL REPORT ON INDIAN MISSIONS OF THE PROVINCIAL SYNOD OF RUPERT'S LAND.

Statistics, etc., for three years from January 1st, 1899, to December 31st, 1901.

CENTRAL MISSIONS AND OUTSTATIONS.	Ordained and Other Missionaries. Catechists marked *	Native Christians Attached to Church.	For three years ending Dec. 31, 1901.						Heathen in Dis- trict.	Mission Schools.	Government Schools.	Scholars.	Mission Buildings.	Value.	REMARKS.
			Communi- cants.	Baptisms, Adults.	Baptisms, Children.	Total.	Confirmed.	Marriages.							
DIOCESE OF RUPERT'S LAND.															
St. Peter's, Dynevor, 1899, 4 Outstations.....		1115	240	2	202	204	82	40	8	4	131	7	\$ 6,840	Grant from C. & C. C. S., one hospital.	Rev. A. E. Cowley, Sec. of C.M.S.
Fairford, 5 Outstations.....	Ven. Archdeacon Phair, Supt.	900	130	9	108	117	...	19	30	4	175	2	4,000	81 children at Indus. schools.	
Scantbury (Brokenhead), 2 Out- stations.....	Rev. J. G. Anderson, B. D., *Wm. Asham, Thos. Hope.....	294	81	4	40	44	15	8	11	1	18	3	1,890	1 station also for settlers.	
Sioux Mission (Griswold), 1890....	Rev. J. F. Cox, *Jos. Itoye.....	100	12	15	23	38	11	5	191	1	6	2	1,500	Day school closed in last year.	
Shoal River, 1890.....	Rev. A. T. Norquay, 1890.....	126	17	3	31	34		3	19	1	21	2	2,300	children at Indus. schools.	
DIOCESE OF SASKATCHE- WAN.															
Prince Albert, 1874.....	Right Rev. C. Pinkham, D.D.														4 Day schools. (Not including Emmanuel Col- lege). Boarding school has 54 scholars.
South Branch (St. James), 1879....	Rev. J. Taylor, Emmanuel Coll.														
Kepowewin or LaCorne, 1855.....	Rev. J. Badger.....	712	250	11	85	96	32	23	142	5	128	6	1,800		Boarding school has 54 scholars. [ment grant.]
Sturgeon Lake, 1891.....	D. Macdonald.....														
Montreal Lake, 1889.....	Robt. Bear.....														Boarding school gets Govern-
Assinipi, 1 Outstation, 1875.....	J. R. Settee.....														
Onion Lake, 4 Outstations, 1879....	Rev. D. D. McDonald, L. Ahenu- ken.....	273	94	5	50	55	8	15	52	1	28	5	\$2,140		
	Rev. J. R. Matheson, J. Brown, A. Fraser, B. Posack.....	194	67	2	20	22	14	2	150	11	69	3	3,000		

Battleford and District, 1877.		304	40	30	43	73	13	242	+	120	Indus. school buildings the property of Government.
Indian School.....	Ven. Archdeacon Mackay, Supt.								3	57	1,400
Red Pheasant and Thunderchild s.....	Rev. B. Matheson								8		
Devon District. The Pas, 1840.....	Rev. R. Inkster, P. McDonald, C. J. Demarais.	690	202	7	82	89	89	45	3	80	4,000
Shoal Lake and Red Earth.....	Rev. J. Hines, T. Henderson, S. Bell, L. Cochrane, C. Jeff, J. Nawakays, A. Head	207	78	9	78	87	13	40	1	27	680
Cumberland.....	Rev. J. R. Settee, C. Quinney, W. Lundie.....	720	181	0	61	61	32	21	1	38	1,400
Stanley, 2 Outstations, 1850.....	Rev. R. McLennan, B.A., S. Abraham.....	332	105	4	39	43	33	21	2	44	1,200
Chemawawin.....	Rev. C. J. Pritchard, R. G. Hooker, and two others.....	186	50		30	30	15	6	1	22	450
Grand Rapids.....	J. Isbister, A. Scott.....										
DIOCESE OF CALGARY.											
Blackfoot Reserve (St. John's), '83.....	Rt. Rev. C. Pinkham, D.D. (Also Bishop of Saskatchewan), Rev. Canon H. W. G. Stocken, Rev. S. J. Stocken.....	94	29	42	39	81	32	10	+	43	13,025 1 hospital
Blood Reserve (St. Paul's), 2 Outstations, 1890.....	Dr. W. Rose, P. Pokapiini, D. Summakenna.....										
Piegan Reserve, 1 Outstation, '80.....	Rev. A. DeB. Owen, L. F. Hardyman.....	80	20	3	3	6	13	3	1199	1	76 7
Sarcee Reserve, 1887.....	W. R. Haynes, Prin. Victoria Home Ven. Archdeacon Tims.....	89 37 84	41 19 5	14 7	55 26	36 2	4 2	2 2	1 1	21 3 16	8,600 5,100 4,200
DIOCESE OF ATHABASCA.											
Chipewyan (St. Paul's).....	Rt. Rev. Richard Young, D.D.	56	32		13	13	9	3	Not given	15 3	Adherents mostly halfbreeds. Miss White.
Vermilion (St. Luke's).....	Rev. A. G. Warwick.....	50	31	3	21	24		3	1	19 3	
Wapuskow and Red River (St. John s).....	Rev. A. S. White, Benj. Coteau.....										
Lesser Slave Lake (St. Peter's), '87.....	Rev. C. R. Weaver, Rev. H. Robinson.....	70	30	6	25	31	6		1	25 2	2,500
Whitfish Lake, 1892.....	Ven. G. Holmes, C. D. White.....	133	45		21	21	20	4	67	40 4	6,300
Athabasca Landing (St. Matthew's), 1895.....	Rev. W. G. White.....	110	12	16	28	44		1	45	2	900
Smoky River, Christchurch.....	Rt. Rev. The Bishop of Athabasca, Rev. M. Johnson.....	+	12	13		9	4	3	1	15 2	2,100
Fort St. John, 1898.....	Vacant.....	36	6		9				1	8 4	2,800 5,800
DIOCESE OF MOOSENEE.											
Moose Factory and New Post.....	Rt. Rev. J. A. Newnham, D.D. (Moose Factory), Rev. T. B. Holland, J. Jeffries, J. Kacheche, J. Fletcher, F. Mark.....	350	120		66	66	25	8	1	100 4	

TRIENNIAL REPORT ON INDIAN MISSIONS.—Continued.

CENTRAL MISSIONS AND OUTSTATIONS.	Ordained and Other Missionaries. Catechists marked *	Native Christians Attached to Church.	For three years ending Dec. 31, 1901.						Heathen in District.	Mission Schools.	Government Schools.	Scholars.	Mission Buildings.	Value.	REMARKS.
			Communi- cants.	Baptisms. Adults.	Baptisms. Children.	Total.	Confirmed.	Marriages.							
Albany District and English River.	Rev. R. J. Renison, J. Wasayabun, J. Coester.	800	220	2	77	79	..	21		1	...	76	4	\$3,700	
Fort Hope, 1894.	Rev. E. Richards, J. Goodwin, W. Coester.	400	30	4	50	54	..	14		1	...	65	4	Not given.	
Rupert House, Osnaburgh, Marlin's Falls, Mistassinie, etc.	Rev. F. Swindlehurst, Rev. W. Ren- ison, W. Minister.	500	168		113	113	...	23		1	...	100	1	1,200	
Matwakumma, 6 Outstations.	Rev. W. C. Walton.	450	80						No re- turn.						
Fort George.	Rev. E. J. Peck.	400	No re- turn.												
Cumberland Sound.			No re- turn.												
DIOCESE OF KEEWATIN. Estab. 1899.	Rt. Rev. Joseph Lofthouse, D. D.														
Fort Alexander, 1850, 2 Outstations	Rev. E. Thomas, R. Thomas, J. Sinciat.	350	109	7	63	70	...	24	40	...	1	85	8	3,500	
Dinorwic or Wabigoon, 1 Outsta- tion	Rev. G. Cook	3	0	1	3	3			? 40		2	32	1	1,500	
Islington	Mr. Newton.	140	20	No re- turn.							1	10	1	500	
Long Sault, 3 Outstations.	Rev. J. Johnston, R. H. Bagshaw, D. W. Wood.	80	0	15	6	21		3	263		4	43	3	2,050	
Lac Seul and Frenchman's Head, 1852, 1 Outstation.	Rev. T. H. Pritchard, Rev. M. Sanderson, J. Fox, R. F. Mac- donald.	400	90	4	56	60		25	50		1	60	3	2,200	
York Factory—Severn	Rev. R. Farley, J. Hart, W. Stony.	340	79		40	40	5	6		1		55	4	Not given.	
Churchill, 1860.	Mr. C. N. Chapman	200	30	30	13	13	8	2	300	1		30	4	3,150	
Split Lake, 1899.	Rev. C. G. Fox, J. Kitebekesik, and others.	300	80		71	71		10		1		72	2	100	

ABSTRACT FROM STATISTICAL REPORT ON INDIAN MISSIONS
For Three Years Ending December 31st, 1901.

DIOCESE.	Stations.	Outstations.	Clergy.	Lay Missionaries and Catechists.	Native Christians.	Communicants.	Baptized in Three Years.	Schools.		Scholars.	Number of Mission Bldgs.	Value.	REMARKS.
								Boarding.	Day.				
Rupert's Land . .	5	11	6	8	2585	480	437	2	11	411	16	\$16,530	{ Diocese reduced by five Stations now in Keewatin. { Battleford Industrial School (supported by Government), Emmanuel College, Union Lake Boarding School.
Saskatchewan . .	15	9	10	20	3658	1067	556	3	17	644	39	17,070	
Calgary	4	1	4	5	297	81	168	4	2	156	19	30,925	
Athabasca . . .	8	2	8	2	460	162	133	3	3	114	18	18,000	
Moosonee . . .	7	14	8	10	2050	618	312	.	4	341	13	10,700	Figures for Stations not complete. Value Buildings part only.
Mackenzie River .	9	2	6	9	844	159	Return Im-perfect.	.	.	.	4	3,500	
Qu'Appelle . . .	2	5	2	2	351	70	78	1	2	62	4	1,200	Buildings for two Stations only.
Selkirk	4	.	7	.	483	77	189	1	4	100	9	5,700	Part Buildings only.
Keewatin	9	10	8	14	408	278	.	.	12	387	26	12,000	Part Buildings only.
Total	63	54	59	70	11086	2992	1873	14	65	2215	148	\$151,625	

INDEX.

TOPICAL INDEX TO THE PAPERS READ AT THE ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

- Absolution, Protestant Doctrines of, Compared, 57
Adaptation of the Church's Methods to the Needs of the Century,
136, 150, 156
Anglican Communion, Relation of its Several Branches, 8
Attitude towards the Church of Rome, 19, 24
Attitude towards the Protestant Communions, 42, 53, 61, 72
Autonomous Churches in Heathen Lands, 30
- Baptism, Protestant Doctrines of, Compared, 55
Bene Decessit, 10
Bible and Higher Criticism, 135
- Christian Family, Preservation of, 107, 118, 123, 131
Church, Ours an American Church, 51
Church and the Indian Races, 93, 103
Church and the Negro Race, 78, 87
Church and the Twentieth Century, 150
Churches, Doctrines of the Protestant Churches Compared, 54
Closing Service, Sermon at, 164
Commercial and Political Morality, 150, 156
- Dependent Races in America, 78, 87, 93, 103
Divorce and Unlawful Marriage, 107, 118, 119, 134
- Family and Parental Obligations, 123, 131
Family Prayers, 139
Family, Preservation of, 107, 118, 134
Foreign Missions, 31
- Heathen Lands, Development of Autonomous Churches in, 30
High Ideals in the Nation, 150, 156
Higher Criticism and the Bible, 135
Home and the State (see also Family), 131
- Indian Missions, Tables on, 171
Indian Races and the Church, 93, 103
Indian Schools, 105
- Lord's Day and Public Worship, 136, 142
Lord's Supper, Protestant Doctrines of, Compared, 56

- Marriage and Divorce, 107, 118, 119, 134
 Methodist Church, Points of Union with the Anglican, 54
 Missions in Heathen Lands, 31
 Morality, Political and Commercial, 150, 156

 Negro Race and the Church, 78, 87
 Negro Race, Methods of Evangelization among, 90

 Old Catholics, 39
 Opening Service, Sermon at, 1
 Ordination, Protestant Doctrines of, Compared, 58

 Parental Obligations, 123, 131
 Points of Difference between Protestant and Anglican Churches,
 61, 72
 Points of Union between Protestant and Anglican Churches,
 42, 53
 Polish Catholic Church, 36
 Political and Commercial Morality, 150, 156
 Prayers in the Family, 139
 Presbyterian Church, Points of Union with Anglican, 53
 Present Century and the Church, 150
 Progress, Unity, System, 164
 Protestant Communion, Attitude towards, 42, 53
 Public Prayer, Protestant Doctrines of, Compared, 57
 Public Worship and the Lord's Day, 136, 142

 Relationship between the Branches of the Anglican Communion,
 8, 13
 Roman Church, Attitude towards, 19, 24

 Sacraments, Doctrines of Protestant Churches Compared with
 Anglican, 54
 Sermon at Opening Service, 1
 Sermon at Closing Service, 164
 State and the Home (see Family), 131
 Sunday Schools and the Church, 133, 160
 System, Unity, Progress, 164

 Tables on Indian Missions, 171
 Twentieth Century, Adaptation of Church's Methods to, 136, 150,
 156
 Twentieth Century and the Church, 150

 Uniat Churches in America, 36
 Unity, 1
 Unity, System, Progress, 164

 Worship and the Lord's Day, 136, 142

BX5021 .C6 1903
Conference of Bishops of the Church of
Conference of Bishops of the Church of

BX Conference of Bishops of the Church of England
5021 in Canada and of the Protestant Episcopal
C6 Church in the United States, Washington, D.C.,
1903 1903.

Conference of Bishops of the Church of England
in Canada and of the Protestant Episcopal Church
in the United States held at the Pro-cathedral,
Washington, D.C., in October, 1903. New York,
Thomas Whittaker [1903?]

178p. 24cm.

Cover-title: All-American Conference of Bishops.

1. Anglican communion.

CCSC/ej

A8392

